# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 51. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1866. WHOLE NO. 1,351.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

☞ ALL LETTERS on Business, or for Publication, should be addressed to PARKER PILLSBURY, *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

CLUB RATES.—Ten copies to one address, $2.50 each; twenty copies, $2 each.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, PRINTER,

No. 33 BEEKMAN STREET, N. Y.


## Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

### *MORE SPEECHES FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON.*

[The columns of THE STANDARD deserve better; but having given the President's speech of the 23d February and the two vetoes, it may be well for the sake of history to put on record the following to a serenading party of soldiers and sailors on Wednesday evening last at the White House and a brief one to the procession at a colored people's celebration :]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON said : It is not affectation in me to say that language is inadequate to convey the heartfelt feelings produced on this occasion by your presence here and by the presentation of your sentiments, as expressed by your representative in his address and in the resolutions which you have thought proper to adopt. I confess that in the peculiar posture of public affairs, your presence and address give encouragement and confidence to me in my efforts to discharge the duties incumbent upon me as Chief Magistrate of the Republic, and in what I have to say, I shall address you in the character of citizens, sailors and soldiers. I shall speak to you on those terms and on none others. I repeat my thanks for the manifestation of your approbation and of your encouragement. (Applause.) We are to-day involved in one of the most critical and trying struggles that have occurred since this Government came into existence. Nations like individuals must have a beginning, must have a birth. Struggling into existence a nation passes through its first trying ordeal. It is not necessary for me now to carry your minds back to the struggle when this nation was born. It is not necessary for me to allude to the privations and hardships of those who were engaged in that struggle to achieve the national birth. It is not necessary to point to the blood shed and the lives lost in accomplishing that result. The next ordeal through which a nation has to pass is when it is called upon to give evidence that it has strength, capacity, and power to maintain itself among the nations of the earth. In giving such evidence we passed through the war of 1812, and through the war with Mexico, and we passed through all the struggles that have since occurred up to the beginning of the rebellion. This was our second ordeal. But a nation has another test still to undergo, and that is to give evidence to the nations of the earth and to its own citizens that it has power to resist internal foes. That it has strength enough to put down treachery at home and treason within its own borders. (Cheers.) We have commenced that ordeal, and I trust in God we will pass through it successfully. (Cheers.) I feel complimented by the allusion of your representative to the fact that I stood in the Senate in 1860 and 1861, when the nation was entering on this third ordeal, and raised my voice and hand against treason, treachery and traitors at home. (Cheers and cries of "good.") I stand here to-day holding to and maintaining the same principles which I then enunciated. (Cheers.) I stand here to-day opposing traitors and treason whether they be in the South or in the North. (Loud cheers.) I stand here to-day as I then stood using all my powers, mental and physical, to preserve this nation in passing through the third phase of its existence. The organized forces and combined powers that recently stood arrayed against us are disbanded and driven from the field. But it does not follow that there are still no enemies against our present form of Government and our free institutions. (Applause.) I then stood in the Senate of the United States denying the doctrine of separation and secession. I denied them, as I deny now, that any State has the right of its own will to separate itself from the other States, and thereby to destroy the Union and break up the Government. And I think I have given some evidence that I have been sincere and in earnest. And now I want to know why it is that the whole train of slanderers and calumniators and traducers have been barking and snapping at my heels? (Cheers.) Why is it that they array themselves against me? Is it because I stand on the side of the people? And when I say "the people," I include the soldiers and sailors. (Cheers.) Why is it that they are arrayed in traducing and villifying and calumniating me? Where were they during the rebellion? (A Voice—"At home in bed."—Laughter.) In the Senate I raised my voice against it, and when it was believed that it would be to the interest of the nation and would assist in putting down the rebellion, did I not leave my place in the Senate?—a place of emolument, ease and distinction, and take my position where the enemy could be reached and where men's lives were in danger? (Cheers, and cries of "That's so.) While I was thus exposed personally and publicly, and in every way, some of my present traducers and calumniators were far removed from the foe, and were enjoying ease and comfort. (Cheers and laughter.) But I care not for them; I care not that slander, the foul whelp of sin, has been turned loose against me. I care not for all that; and, let me tell you here to-day, that, although pretty well advanced in life, I feel that I shall live long enough to live down the whole pack of traducers and slanderers. (Applause.) They have turned the whole pack loose to lower me in your estimation. (Voice—They cannot do it.) Tray, Blanche and Sweetheart, little dogs and all, come along snapping and snarling at my heels. But I heed them not. (Cheers.) The American people, citizens, soldiers and sailors, know that from my advent into public life to the present moment, I have always stood unyieldingly and unwaveringly the advocate and defender of their rights and interests. (Cheers.) We are now in the nation's third ordeal; we are not yet through it. We said that States could not go out of the Union; we denied the doctrine of secession, and we have demonstrated that we were right. We demonstrated it by the strong arm; yes, the soldiers and the sailors—God bless them!—have demonstrated by their patriotic hearts and strong arms, that States have not the power to leave the Union. (Applause.) What followed? The Confederate armies were overpowered and disbanded, and there was a willingness on the part of the people of those States to come back, be obedient to the laws, and acknowledge the supremacy of the Constitution of our fathers. For what have we passed through this third ordeal? It was to establish the principle that no State had the power to break up the Government; it was to put down the rebellion. The rebellion has been put down, and for what? Was it to destroy the States? (Voices—"Never!") For what have all these lives been sacrificed and all this treasure expended? Was it for the purpose of destroying States? No; it was for the purpose of preserving the States in the Union of our fathers. (Cheers.) It was for that you fought—it was for that I tried not to break up the Government, but to put down the rebellion and preserve the Union of the States. That is what we have been contending for, and to establish the fact that the nation can lift itself above and beyond intestine foes, and treason, and traitors at home. When the rebellion in Massachusetts was put down, did that put Massachusetts out of the Union and destroy the State? When the rebellion in Pennsylvania was put down, did that destroy the State and put it out of the Union? So when the recent great rebellion was put down, and the Constitution and laws of the country restored, the States engaged in it, the rebellion being crushed, the law restored and the Constitution acknowledged in them, stand in the Union, constituting a part of the glorious and bright galaxy of States. (Loud cheers.) In passing through this ordeal, what has been done in Tennessee under the direction of my lamented predecessor? We commenced the work of restoration; we succeeded before I came here in restoring the relations which had existed between Tennessee and the rest of the Union with one exception, and that was the relation of representation. I came to Washington, and under extraordinary circumstances succeeded to the Presidential chair. What then? The Congress of the United States had adjourned without prescribing any plan. I then proceeded as I had done in my own State under the direction of the Government to restore the other States. And how did we begin? We found the people had no Court, and we said to the judges, the district-attorneys and marshals, "Go down and hold your Courts; the people need the tribunals of justice to be opened." Was there anything wrong in that? The Courts were opened. What else? We looked out and saw that the people down there had no mails; they had been interrupted and cut off by the operation of the rebellion. We said to the Postmaster-General, "Let the people have facilities for mail communication and let them again begin to understand what we all feel and think—that we are one people." We looked out again and saw that there was a blockade, that the custom-houses were all closed. We said, "Open the doors of the custom-house and remove the blockade; let trade and commerce and the pursuits of peace be restored," and it was done. We thus travelled on step by step, opening custom-houses, appointing collectors, establishing mail facilities and restoring all relations that had been interrupted by the rebellion. Was there anything undertaken to be done here that was not authorized by the Constitution; that was not justified by the great necessities of the case; that has not been clearly consonant with the Constitution and with the genius-spirit of our Government? (Cheers.) What remained to be done? One other thing remained—to demonstrate to the civilized and pagan world that we had passed successfully through the third ordeal of our national existence, and proved that our Government was perpetual. A great principle was to be restored, which was established in our Revolution, when our fathers were contending against the power of Great Britain. What was one of the principal causes of their complaint? It was that they were denied representation. They complained of taxation without representation. (Cheers.) One of the great principles laid down by our fathers, and which fired their hearts, was that there should be no taxation without representation. How, then, does the matter stand? Who has been usurping power? Who has been defeating the operation of the Constitution? And what now remains to be done to complete the restoration of these States to all their former relations with the Federal Government, and to finish the great ordeal through which we have been passing? It is to admit representatives. (Cheers.) And when we say admit representatives, what do we mean? We mean representation in the constitutional and law abiding sense, as was intended at the beginning of the Government. The Constitution declares in express terms, that each House, the Senate and House of Representatives, each acting for itself, shall be the judge of the returns, election and qualification of its own members. It is for each House to settle that question under the Constitution and under the solemn sanction of an oath. And can we believe that either House would admit any member into its body to participate in the legislation of the country who was not qualified and fit to sit in that body and participate in its proceedings? They have the power—not the two Houses, but each House for itself. The Constitution further declares that no State shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States without its consent. Then, where do we stand? All that is needed to finish this great work of restoration is for the two Houses, respectively, to determine the question. Oh! but some one will say, "A traitor might come in." The answer to that is that each House must be the judge, and if a traitor presents himself, cannot either House know that he is a traitor? (Applause.) And if he is a traitor, can they not kick him out of the door, and send him back, saying to the people who sent him, "You must send us a loyal man." (Cheers, and a voice, "That's logic.") Is there any difficulty about that? (No, no, and cheers.) If a traitor presents himself to either House, cannot that House say to him, "No, you cannot be admitted into this body. Go back. We will not deny your people the right of representation, but they must send a loyal representative. (Cheers.) And when the States do send loyal representatives, can you have any better evidence of their fidelity to the Constitution and the laws? There is no one learned in the Constitution and laws who will say that if a traitor happens to get into Congress, that body cannot expel him after he gets in. That makes assurance doubly sure, and conforms the action of the Government to the Constitution of our fathers. Hence I say, let us stand by that Constitution; and in standing by it the covenant will be preserved. While I have been contending against traitors and secession and treason and the dissolution of the Union, I have been contending at the same time against the consolidation of power here. (Cries of "Good!") I think the consolidation of power here is equally dangerous with the separation of the States. (Cheers.) The one would totter us and might run into anarchy, while the other would concentrate and eventuate in monarchy. (Cheers, and cries of "Can't do it!") Oh! but there is an idea abroad that one man can be a despot, that one man can be but a usurper; but that a hundred or two hundred men cannot. Mr. Jefferson, the Apostle of Liberty, tells us, and so does common sense, that tyranny and despotism can be exercised by many more rigorously, more vigorously and more tyrannically, than by one. What power has your President to be a tyrant? what can he do? what can he originate? Why, they say he exercises the veto power. (Laughter.) What is the veto power? (A Voice—"To put down the nigger." Laughter.) Who is your President? Several voices—"Andy Johnson.") Is he not elected by the people through the electoral college? The President is nothing more than the tribune of the people. His office is tribunal in its character. In olden times when tribunes were first elected in the Roman Republic, they stood at the door of the Roman Senate, which was then encroaching on the popular rights and putting the heel of power on the necks of the people. The people chose a Tribune, and placed him at the door of the Senate, so that when that body ventured an oppressive act he was clothed with power to say "Veto, I forbid." Your President now is the tribune of the people. I thank God I am, and I intend to assert the power which the people have placed in me. (Cheers.) Your President, standing here, day after day, and discharging his duty, is like a horse on a tread-wheel, and because he dares differ in opinion in regard to public measures, he must be denounced as a usurper and tyrant. Can he originate anything under the veto power? I think the veto power is conservative in its character and affirmative. All that can be done by the veto power is to say when legislation is improper, hasty, unwise, or unconstitutional, stop action, wait till this can be submitted to the people, and let them consider whether it is right or wrong. (Applause.) That is all true isn't it? Hence I say that tyranny and power can be exercised somewhere else than by the Executive. He is powerless. All that he can do to check legislation, to hold it in a state of abeyance till the people can consider and understand what is being done then. What has been done? I have done what I believe the Constitution required me to do. (Applause.) I have done what I believe my duty and conscience required me to do. (Cheers.) So believing I intend to stick to my position, relying on the judgment, the integrity and the intelligence of the masses of the American people, the soldiers and sailors expressly. (Cheers.) Then, for my life I cannot see where there is any tyranny. It is very easy to impugn motives, and suspect the purest and best acts of a man's life. If you come forward and propose a certain thing your motives are suspected and condemned. And if you withhold your opinion you are regarded as being opposed to the matter; so that it is very hard to move one way or the other so far as certain persons are concerned. On any question pertaining to the interests of the great masses of the American people—for in them is my hope for the salvation of the country—I am with you, citizen soldiers and sailors. Who has sacrificed or perilled more than the humble individual who addresses you? Has not my all been been put on it—my life, my property; everything sacred and dear to man has been staked upon it. And can I now be suspected of faltering at the close of this third ordeal of the nation? Where is he in public or private life who has sacrificed more, or who has devoted more of his time and energies to the accomplishment of the great end than I? And I have done it from the promptings of my own heart and conscience. I believe it was right; and with your hearts and your countenance and your encouragement I shall go through on that line. (Cheers and laughter.) And when I come to talk about sailors and soldiers, about this to be done and that to be done, all I want is for you to wait and see. So far as the future is concerned, wait and see if I do not stand by you, although every other may falter and fail. (Cheers.) I want to see measures of policy brought forward that will advance the interests of the people, and of that portion of the people who constitute the gallant and brave men who, in both branches of the service, have upheld the national flag and sustained the country in the recent struggle. I thank you, gentlemen, for the encouragement. I thank you for your countenance on this occasion! It cheers me on and gives me strength to perform the work before me. If we are true to ourselves, if we are true to the Constitution, the day is not far distant when this Government will be restored. Let us go on and restore the Government! Let us enlarge the area of our commerce and trade! and let us not only inspire confidence at home, but respect abroad, by letting the nation resume its career of prosperity and greatness! I know that some will find fault with me and say I am too lenient, too kind, and all that. If we were all to be put to death, or punished, or thrown away, for one offence, or for the second offence, and were to be lost and excluded from society and communion with our fellow-men, how many of us would be left? I have felt, when I have done wrong and repented of it, that I was as sincere and honest as he who had done no wrong at all. Then we must reason with each other, and understand our nature, and what is necessary to restore peace and harmony and concord to a distracted and divided people. In time of war it is right to burn villages, sack cities and devastate fields, to lay waste a country and cripple and reduce the enemy. But in time of peace the converse of that course is precisely the right one, and the true policy of a nation is to rebuild its cities, restore its villages, renew its fields of agriculture, and let all the avocations of peace and prosperity be restored. I know there are some who have been home calculating during the war, and who bring to the consideration of questions of peace, harmony and the avocations of civil life all the feelings of resentment which animated us when the excitement was running high. But take the brave men who sustained the flag on the field and on the wave, and you will find better feelings and better judgment on these questions than you will find with those who have been sitting in the closet and never smelled gunpowder. (Cheers.) Yes, from the private up to the Commanding-General, they know better how to treat the present circumstances than any of those closet patriots and humanitarians. Then, my countrymen, fellow-citizens, soldiers and sailors, let us rejoice that peace has come. Let us rejoice that the relations of the States are about being restored. Let us make every effort we can on proper principles to restore the relations which existed between the Federal Government and the States. And I thank God that peace is restored. I thank God that our brave men can return to their families and homes, and resume their peaceful avocations. I thank God that the baleful planet of fire and blood which a short time ago was in the ascendant, has been chased away by the benignant star of peace. Now that star of peace is suspended in the heavens. Let us cultivate the earth and the relations of peace—all those associations which appertain to men in peace. The time is not distant when we can have a political millenium—political jubilee, and when we can proclaim to all the nations of the earth that we are again a united people, and that we have triumphantly passed through our third ordeal—have peace at home and power to bid defiance to all the world. (Loud cheers.) Remember one thing, gentlemen, that in my past life, though slanderers may misrepresent, none can say that I ever deceived or betrayed him. It will be for you to see in the future who will redeem all his promises, and who will be most faithful. I thank you, gentlemen, for the compliment you have paid me.

As the President closed his speech, he was loudly and continuously cheered. The band performed some more patriotic airs, and the immense crowd dispersed.

AND STILL ANOTHER.

The celebration of the Emancipation of Slavery in the District of Columbia took place in Washington, on Thursday of last week. Two regiments of colored troops and various colored civic associations, with many other colored citizens, assembled in front of the Executive Mansion. After firing of cannon and the playing of several national airs, three cheers were given for the President of the United States, who having been escorted to a prominent position by United States Marshal Gooding, and his private Secretary Col. Wm. G. Moore, addressed the assemblage as follows :

MY COLORED FRIENDS : I have nothing more to say to you on this occasion than to thank you for this compliment you have paid in presenting yourselves before me on this your day of celebration.

I come forward for the purpose of indicating my approbation and manifesting my appreciation of the respect thus offered or conferred.

I thank you for the compliment, and I mean what I say—and I will remark in this connection, that the time will come, and that too before a great while, when the colored population of the United States will find out who have selected them as a hobby and a pretence by which they can be successful in obtaining and maintaining power, and who have been their truest friends and wanted them to participate in and enjoy the blessings of freedom.

The time will come when it will be known who contributed as much as any other man, and who, without being considered egotistical, I may say, contributed more in procuring the great national guarantee of the abolition of Slavery in all the States, by the ratification of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving a national guarantee that Slavery shall no longer be permitted to exist or be re-established in the jurisdiction of the United States.

I know how easy it is to cater to prejudice, and how easy it is to excite feelings of prejudice and unkindness. I care not for that. I have been engaged in this work, in which my life has been perilled. I was not engaged in it as a hobby, nor did I ride the colored men for the sake of gaining power. What I did was for the purpose of establishing the great principle of freedom; and, thank God, I feel and know it to be so, that my efforts have contributed as much, if not more, in accomplishing this great national guarantee than those of any other living man in the United States.

It is very easy for colored men or any men to have pretended friends ensconced in high places, and far removed from danger, whose eyes have only abstractly gazed on freedom, who have never exposed their limbs or property, and who never contributed a sixpence in furtherance of the great cause, while another perilled his all and put everything sacred and dear to man, and those whom he raised, and who lived with him, now enjoy his property, with his consent, and receive his aid and assistance. Yet some assume to be, and others who have done nothing are considered the great defenders and protectors of the colored man. I repeat, my colored friends here to-day, the time will come, and that not far distant, when it will be proved who is practically your best friends. My friendship as far as it has gone, has not been for place or power, for I had these already. It has been a principle with me, and I thank God the great principle has been established, that whenever any individual, in the language of a distinguished orator, treads American soil, "his soul swells within him, in appreciation of the great truth that he stands forth redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled by the genius of universal emancipation." (Applause.) Then let me mingle with you in celebration of the day which commenced your freedom. I do it in sincerity and truth, and trust in God the blessings which have been conferred may be appreciated and enjoyed by you, and that you may give them a proper direction. There is something for all to do. You have high and solemn duties to perform, and you ought to remember that freedom is not a mere idea. It must be reduced to practical reality. Men in being free have to deny themselves many things which seem to be embraced in the idea of universal freedom. It is with you to give evidence to the world and the people of the United States whether you are going to appreciate this great boon as it should be, and that you are worthy of being freemen. Then let me thank you with sincerity for the compliment you have paid me by passing through here to-day and paying your respects to me. I repeat again, that the time will come when you will know who have been your best friends, and who have not been your friends from mercenary considerations. Accept my thanks.

## Selections.

### *COLORED PEOPLE IN JUBILEE.*

[The celebration of Emancipation, held in Washington on Thursday last week (postponed from Monday on account of the weather) was to the colored people of the city and District a very brilliant affair. The Washington correspondent of the *Tribune* gives a long account of it, from which the following is extracted :]

THE turn-out of the freedmen was much larger than was anticipated, and it is estimated that as many as 20,000 of both sexes joined in the procession. Notwithstanding the predictions of the "old residents" and Copperheads generally, of scenes of riot and bloodshed which would be the legitimate result of this attempt on the part of a disenthralled race to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the day on which the chain that for over 200 years had bound them in bondage was broken, not the slightest disturbance occurred to mar the enjoyment by the freedmen of their jubilee, the grandest and most imposing ever held by them on the continent. The arrangements for the entire celebration were most admirably conducted, and barring one unforseen accident, or rather ludicrous incident, which resulted in no casualties, were perfect. The freedmen all appeared in their holiday attire, and the members of different civic socities in appropriate regalia. Early in the morning the freedmen of both sexes and of all ages assembled by thousands at the point of rendezvous, and at 11 o'clock the procession commenced moving through the principal streets of the city. The fine soldierly appearance of the two colored regiments, which formed a part of the procession, excited universal remark, and was the theme of general commendation. Prominent among the sea of banners were a score bearing the picture of President Lincoln, while on most of the others were inscriptions from his speeches in favor of the freedom of the slave. It was a noticeable circumstance that *not a line from the eccentric utterances of the gentleman who once voluntarily promised to assume the role of a certain biblical celebrity*, ornamented a single flag or banner in the procession. On the arrival of the procession at the headquarters of Gen. Grant, who was lustily cheered, it was greeted with the thunder of a battery of artillery, which, by the General's express order, had been directed to salute the procession during its passage. From Gen. Grant's headquarters the procession filed into the President's grounds, and on arriving in front of the Executive Mansion, halted apparently prepared for a speech from their Presidential "Moses." A short time elapsed when the President came forward, and after order had been restored spoke as follows :

[See the speech in its appropriate column.]

At the conclusion of the President's speech, which was but occasionally and but feebly applauded, a few of the freedmen approached the President for the purpose of shaking him by the hand. A superannuated colored man, on shaking hands with the President, remarked that he hoped he would do all he could for the colored people; on which the President replied : "I"—"I shall, I promise you." "Excuse me, Mr. President," replied the former bondsman; "but I hope you will help us a little more than you have done"—a remark which excited great merriment among the assembled crowd. The procession then filed into Pennsylvania avenue, where, truth to say, it was greeted by loyal thousands, who, by cheers, and the waving of handkerchiefs, expressed their sympathy for the cause of freedom for the colored race.

The celebration was closed with religious services and the delivery of addresses in Franklin Square, in the presence of a vast multitude. The stand on the south side of the square was calculated to seat about one hundred persons, and was handsomely decorated, a large national flag being displayed on either side, and one hanging in festoons at the front corners, with one in front on which was a message of President Lincoln as follows :

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES : The act entitled "An Act for the release of certain persons held to service in the District of Columbia," has this day been approved and signed.

A. LINCOLN.

April 16, 1862.

Over the top of this stand was the inscription :

"Lincoln, the liberator of millions. His great work is done, and he sleeps in peace in the great prairies of the West. We are loyal to God and to our country. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes :

Also :

"We have received our civil rights. Give us the right of suffrage and the work is done."

Besides the large flags about this stand, there were a profusion of small ones. On the left of the speakers' stand, another stand was erected for the musicians. Rev. Henry Highland Garnet, colored, made the opening speech, and read a series of resolutions expressive of the views of the assemblage, and approving the course of Congress.

Senator Trumbull, of Illinois (the author of the Civil Rights bill) spoke at length, tracing the progress of emancipation, and alluding to other matters in that connection.

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts (the author of the bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia), next addressed the meeting. While he was speaking, standing on a chair, about the Civil Rights bill, the flooring of the platform broke through, precipitating all who were upon it to the ground. There was naturally wide-spread alarm, and a momentary apprehension of personal injury by this disaster. After the interval of a few minutes, it was ascertained that they had all escaped with no other damage than a few bruises and a severe jolting. Some of them fell on the top of others, thus causing a promiscuous mixture. It is said that a black boy who was standing near the platform had his back broken, and that a woman of the same complexion was so much injured that it was necessary to convey her from the ground. The excitement over, the speakers resorted to the adjoining platform, and Senator Wilson resumed his speech at the point where it was unhappily broken off by the falling of the unsubstantial structure. He said that he had been informed that the President in his speech had remarked that the colored population would very soon discover who were their real friends. He was not here to dispute the President's claim to be called their friend. The President was placed in the Executive chair by the votes of anti-slavery men, and they only asked him to exercise his high functions for the promotion of the rights and the vindication of all. He hoped the President would place himself in advance of them. They asked him to go forward, and they would hail him as the best friend of the black man whenever he so proved himself.

Maj.-Gen. Howard, George Howard Day and Rev. Mr. Anderson, of New York, also addressed the meeting. There were on the stand, among others, Gen. Eaton, Senators Lane, of Maryland, Chandler, Clark and Howard. The ceremonies here terminated, and the crowd dispersed. It is not known that the celebration was marred by any accident other than that above related. It was a glorious day for the colored population.

The celebration of the Civil Rights bill triumph in Norfolk assumed a very tragic character. Dispatches say the riotous demonstrations attending the negro procession in Norfolk to celebrate the passage of the Civil Rights bill, proves to have been a more serious affray than at first reported.

The disturbance occurred in a field on Upper Union street, in the suburbs of the city, and originated with a number of the rowdy element jeering at the procession. Fire-arms were frequently discharged, and, as is usual in such cases, innocent spectators were the greatest sufferers. But the firing began with the whites.

The following are the names of those killed and wounded ;

Robert Whitehurst, killed, and his step-mother mortally wounded.

John Whitehurst, dangerously wounded.

William Mosely, a city watchman, badly beaten, and his son so dangerously wounded that his life is despaired of.

Lawrence Hampton, a colored man, was seriously wounded by a bayonet in the hands of one of the negroes.

During the night fears were entertained of another disturbance, and a telegram was sent to Gen. Miles for additional troops; but these were not needed, as the events of the night proved, and everything passed off in quietness.

### ABRAHAM DAVENFORT.

BY J. G. WHITTIER.

In the old days (a custom laid aside
With breeches and cocked hats) the people sent
Their wisest men to make the public laws.
And so, from a brown homestead, where the Sound
Drinks the small tribute of the Mianas,
Waved over by the woods of Rippowams,
And hallowed by pure lives and tranquil deaths,
Stamford sent up to the councils of the State
Wisdom and grace in Abraham Davenport.

'Twas on a May-day of the far old year
Seventeen hundred eighty, that there fell
Over the bloom and sweet life of the Spring,
Over the fresh earth and the heaven of noon,
A horror of great darkness, like the night
In day of which the Norland sagas tell,—
The Twilight of the Gods. The low-hung sky
Was black with ominous clouds, save where its rim
Was fringed with a dull glow, like that which climbs
The crater's sides from the red hell below.
Birds ceased to sing, and all the barn-yard fowls
Roosted; the cattle at the pasture bars
Lowed, and looked homeward; bats on leathern wings.
Flitted abroad; the sounds of labor died;
Men prayed, and women wept; all ears grew sharp
To hear the doom-blast of the trumpet shatter
The black sky, that the dreadful face of Christ
Might look from the rent clouds, not as he looked
A loving guest at Bethany, but stern
As Justice and inexorable Law.

Meanwhile in the old State-House, dim as ghosts,
Sat the lawgivers of Connecticut,
Trembling beneath their legislative robes.
"It is the Lord's Great day! Let us adjourn,"
Some said; and then, as if with one accord,
All eyes were turned to Abraham Davenport.
He rose, slow clearing with his steady voice
The intolerable hush. "This well may be
The Day of Judgment which the world awaits;
But be it so or not, I only know
My present duty, and my Lord's command
To occupy till he come. So at the post
Where he hath set me in his providence,
I choose, for one, to meet him face to face,—
No faithless servant, frightened from my task,
But ready when the Lord of the harvest calls;
And therefore, with all reverence, I would say,
Let God do his work, we will see to ours.
Bring in the candles." And they brought them in.

Then by the flaring lights the Speaker read,
Albeit with husky voice and shaking hands,
An act to amend an act to regulate
The shad and alewive fisheries. Whereupon
Wisely and well spake Abraham Davenport,
Straight to the question, with no figures of speech
Save the nine Arab signs, yet not without
The shrewd, dry humor natural to the man :
His awe-struck colleagues listening all the while,
Between the pauses of his argument,
To hear the thunder of the wrath of God
Break from the hollow trumpet of the cloud.

And there he stands in memory to this day,
Erect, self-poised, a rugged face, half seen
Against the background of unnatural dark,
A witness to the ages as they pass,
That simple duty hath no place for fear.

—*Atlantic Monthly for May.*

### *CONGRESS.*

THURSDAY, April 19.

IN the Senate Mr. McDougall rose and said : A few days ago I made some remarks of a personal nature. It is believed by my personal friends that those remarks were a violation of the decorum of the Senate. After their advice, and on careful consideration, I now acknowledge the wrong, and ask the pardon of the Senate. More than that, I have already asked the pardon of my colleague from California. That day the sun went down on my wrath, and peace did not return until the next morning when the sun was high above the misty mountain tops, when it came with penitence, and these are are penitential remarks.

Mr. Wilson asked the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the Colorado bill.

Mr. Sumner said there were two reasons for not taking up the bill to-day. The first was that the Senate was not full at present, and the second was that the day was dedicated to the freedmen. The streets of the city were filled with a happy people rejoicing in the anniversary of their emancipation. This was no day to recognize inequality of rights and to insult public sentiment by admitting a State recognizing distinction on account of color.

Mr. Wilson said his colleague [Sumner] was the most earnest man in the Senate on the bill to enable Colorado to form a State government. He did not then insist upon this question of inequality. He [Sumner] voted for giving them power to form a Constitution to suit themselves, and said not a word about the question he now raised. Mr. Wilson said that while he would vote for the admission of Colorado under her present Constitution, he would vote against enabling acts in the future for all Territories, in which distinction on account of color was recognized. But as the Enabling act for Colorado was passed in good faith without a qualification as to equality of rights, Congress ought to admit it under that act.

Mr. Sumner—My colleague was not here, and he did not hear the answer, and therefore he has to-day without knowing the facts revived the charge of inconsistency. Holding the documents in my hand on that occasion I showed that the enabling act provided as follows :

"That all persons qualified by law to vote for Representatives to the General Assembly of said Territory, at the date of the passage of this act, shall be qualified to be elected; and they are hereby authorized to vote for and choose representatives to form a convention."

That is, the electors, according to this Enabling act, were the electors at that time, authorized as such by the territorial statutes. Holding the territorial statutes in my hand, I showed you that when that act was pending in the Senate of the United States, *all persons without distinction of color, were authorized to be electors.* That was the answer that I gave before; that is the answer that I give now. Therefore, sir, I say that when I voted for this Enabling act, I did not vote with any idea that there could be a discrimination founded on color; on the contrary, I voted with the positive conviction that all possibility of such discrimination was excluded; and still further, in that very Enabling act I voted for this proposition ;

"The Constitution, when formed, shall be republican, and not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence."

Now, sir, I insist that the Constitution which has been presented to us is not republican, and I further insist that it is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence. My excellent colleague will certainly not maintain the contrary of that proposition. He will not say that a constitution which undertakes to exclude persons from their rights on account of color is consistent with the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, and that, sir, is the very requirement of this enabling act for which I then voted. I insist that if you appeal to that enabling act you shall appeal to it not in any particular part, but in its whole. I appeal to it in that fundamental requirement that what is done shall be in harmony with the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Lane, of Indiana, spoke in favor of the admission of Colorado. There was no Enabling act on the statue book which Mr. Sumner insisted on.

Mr. Sumner—Is it not time to begin?

Mr. Lane, of Indiana, said it was time to begin when the Enabling act was being passed. The Senator from Massachusetts [Sumner] voted for the Enabling act of Colorado and Nevada, without insisting upon equality. He [Lane] wished the word "white" was not in the Constitution of Colorado, but he would not exclude the State on that account.

Mr. Grimes said that the Senate was not bound by the Enabling act, inasmuch as Colorado had once refused to come in under it. He maintained that the population of Colorado was not sufficient for the purposes of a State government. With what grace, he asked, could the Senate admit Colorado while she excluded negroes from the right of suffrage, and in a few days insist that Virginia should permit negroes to vote? He could not indorse the Constitution of Colorado to-day and afterwards undertake to confer the right of suffrage to colored people in the South.

Mr. Sumner contended that the Enabling act failed with the refusal of Colorado to come in under it.

The morning hour expired while Mr. Sumner was speaking.

A discussion arose on a motion to continue the consideration of this subject, in the course of which Mr. Trumbull said that the opponents of the bill were acting unfairly, and pursuing a course which was in opposition to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. Grimes replied to Mr. Trumbull, saying that as one of the opponents of the bill, he was heartily tired of his [Trumbull's] lectures, and he begged him to withhold them, so far as he [Grimes] was concerned, in the future.

Mr. Trumbull said he had never assumed to lecture anybody in the Senate, least of all the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Grimes]. He [Trumbull] should learn from him [Grimes], and not attempt to teach him.

Mr. Yates hoped that the bill would be considered to-day, and for a reason directly opposite to that which animated the Senator from Massachusetts [Sumner] in coming to a different conclusion. He [Yates] thought there could be no better day than this, when so many happy people were celebrating their emancipation, to add another star to the galaxy.

The Colorado bill was made the special order for Tuesday, and should any result be reached on that day, it may be expected in THE STANDARD.

### *THE LIQUOR BUSINESS.*

THE Health Board of this city has taken hold of its work in good earnest. But why leave open six thousand bottomless pits? At a meeting, last week, the subject of licensing having been taken up, Mr. Acton said that one man in this city owns fourteen dram-shops; another owns nine; others three or four each. Last year the Metropolitan police made seventy thousand arrests for drunkenness, and for crime resulting from drunkenness; and since the Metropolitan police are to get nine-tenths of the money which is derived from licensing, Mr. Acton proposed that the men who make so much work for policemen should be coerced into the payment of a handsome sum for their licenses. He therefore hoped that the Board would require every applicant, to whom they might grant license, to pay $250. Messrs. Bergen and Manierre concurred.

Dr. Swinburne remarked that if the Board would grant cheap licenses—say $25—to venders of lager beer, and if they would cultivate among the people a taste for beverages which are comparatively harmless, then the Board would work a true reform; and Mr. Schultz and the physicians of the Board indorsed this view. After considerable discussion, it was voted that there be two classes of licenses, and that the first class license fee, or the license to retail ale, beer and spirituous liquors, be $250. In fixing the price for a license to retail only ale or beer, there was no little difficulty. At At length the license fee for the retailing of ale and beer was fixed at $100 annually.

On motion of Mr. Bergen, it was unanimously voted that no license shall be given for the sale of any ale, beer or spirituous liquors in any grocery within the Metropolitan Police District, excepting the county of Westchester; but the Board does not prohibit the sale of liquors by the bottle, to be taken from the premises.

Mr. Bergen estimated that under the resolutions thus far adopted, *the Board will peremptorily close four thousand bars in New York and Brooklyn.* This will leave about six thousand persons and firms to whom the Board will grant license. Assuming that one half of these will pay $250 each, and the residue $100 each, we have an annual revenue of $1,050,000, ten per cent. of which goes to the State Inebriate Asylum, and nine per cent. toward the support of the Metropolitan police.

### *SOME COMFORT.*

[The Mobile *Adeertiser*, the speaking trumpet of the once well known and even Hon. John Forsyth, says of the "Civil Rights bill :]

"THE Civil Rights bill violates the last lingering remains of State rights." "But," says Mr. Forsyth, "we in the South have relinquished those principles. We have fought for them and suffered for them in vain. We have been defeated. We have given them up. In *losing the great fight we lost all.* We have submitted under the pressure of irresistible force to a revolution in the character of our Federal relations. We are outside of any *further contest* for the *old landmarks.* If anything of State rights is to be saved from the general wreck *it must* be by others. Whatever it may be we ought to be thankful for it, but we have no *reason to claim* or to expect it. If nothing be saved, it is only what we were prepared, or ought to have been prepared to expect."

[But Mr. Forsyth comforts himself and his readers thus :]

The Civil Rights bill does not confer upon negroes the right to vote, to hold office, to serve as jurors, or to interfere with the regulations and customs of steamboats, railroads, street cars, theatres, or other places of public resort. It does not interfere with social relations in any manner whatever.

The truth is, we have in our very midst a rare and striking example of the practical effects that may be expected to result from this bill. We refer to the colored creoles of Mobile and its vicinity.

These people, although of African and mixed blood, were citizens under the Spanish Government, on an equal footing, in all respects, with other citizens. The treaty of 1819, by which this portion of Alabama (with Florida) was ceded to the United States, expressly guaranteed to them a continuance of the privilege of citizenship. They have actually been citizens of Alabama and Florida for nearly half a century. To those familiar with the country, we need not add that they have been good citizens—among the very best of citizens. No conflict has ever occurred as to their *status.* The question of evidence has never been raised, that we are aware of; or, if raised, it has never occasioned any difficulty. The colored creoles have always maintained their position as a separate race—socially holding themselves aloof both from the whites and negroes, but never interfering with either. They have been exemplary in the discharge of all the duties of citizenship, neighborhood, and hospitality, and have secured the respect of all classes of society. There has been no collision of races.

Now, as we have intimated, the effect of the "Civil Rights bill" will be to give the negroes a political status almost, if not altogether, identical with that already occupied by the colored creoles. As this has so long existed in the one case without creating any difficulty, we do not see any great reason to apprehend very serious evils in the other.

As to the social relations, they cannot be effected. The whites, the colored creoles, and the freedmen will continue to be—as they have all along been—separate and distinct classes. No legislation can render it otherwise.

We are not attempting to defend or to extenuate the odious features of the "Civil Rights bill." These have been clearly enough pointed out by the President in his veto message.

[The above remarks from such a source give additional force to the following from the Providence *Journal* :]

The President yesterday reminded the colored inhabitants of the District how much

that the States themselves have control of suffrage among their inhabitants. But there is no question at all that Congress may say who shall vote in the District. And it seems to us that there should be no question about their admitting a portion at least of the blacks to the polls. Mr. Alexander H. Stephens tells us that he should be willing to see a portion of the blacks in Georgia enjoying the franchise. It is not only due to the colored men themselves that those who are properly qualified by intelligence and character should be permitted to vote, but it is important that Congress, acting for the nation, should set a proper example to those States, Northern as well as Southern, which refuse the black man, no matter how intelligent and virtuous he may be, access to the ballot-box. Let them practically declare their faith that a black man, possessing the same qualifications as his white neighbor, may as safely be entrusted with the power of voting.

### *WHAT IS A TRIBUNE OF THE PEOPLE?*

From the Philadelphia Press.

"I am a Tribune of the People."—*Andrew Johnson to the soldiers, April* 18, 1866.

As a new order of things is sought to be established, in which the Chief Magistrate of this great Union is to be designated Tribune of the People, though the Constitution has declared that "The President" shall be his title, it may not be without advantage to turn over a few pages of history and see what the plebeian Tribunate really was. If, instead of being American, we are henceforth to be Roman, let us, at least, ascertain what were the history, the character and the functions of a Tribune of the People. Without the slightest hope of being so classical as the author and champion of what is now known as "MY policy," we may yet act as a junior teacher under that great political pedagogue.

The office of Tribune was established in Rome when first the plebeian, or subject-class, made a successful stand against the patrician order, which, after the overthrow of the monarchy, had become the ruling power there. There were five Tribunes at first, and at a later time there were ten. They were, in effect, magistrates of the plebeian order, but they gradually gained more and more power, until, at last, they usurped the whole. They were protected with great privileges. Macaulay says: "The person of the Tribune was inviolable; and though he could directly effect little, he *could obstruct everything.*" It must be confessed that, in this respect, *ovr* Tribune of the People has a great resemblance to his Roman prototype. Moreover, as Dr. Smith informs us, the Tribunes having "gradually gained more and more power, obtained *the right of putting a Veto upon any public business.*" The Tribunes frequently opposed the Senate, often prevented the business of legislation, and also prevented the Consuls from summoning the Senate. Gibbon says: "Then force was suited rather for *opposition* than for *action.*" They could obstruct, rather than create, but theirs (the same high authority affirms) was "a dangerous influence." Merivale records that Sylla "abridged the power of the Tribunes, who, in addition to their original office of protecting the interest of the plebeians, had *usurped direct control over the deliberations of the Senate.*" At times, says Macaulay, they "continued to exert, to the full extent, their *power of stopping the whole machine of the government.*"

A Tribune of the People, then, was one of a body of officers nominally the protectors of the people, but gradual usurpers of sovereign power—men (we cannot mean any personal application) who, as the old adage has it, "if given an inch would take an ell;" who were protected with great privileges; who, though they could *do* little, could *obstruct everything;* who had the power of putting the Veto upon any public business; who were in the frequent habit of preventing the business of legislation by *opposing the Senate;* who often interfered to *prevent the Senate from meeting;* who, instead of minding their own business, had *usurped direct control over the deliberations of the Senate,* and who sometimes misused their power so as *to stop the whole machine of the government.*

### *HON. CHARLES SUMNER AND M. THIERS.*

[The following from the Washington *Chronicle* will no doubt interest the readers of THE STANDARD; but they will hope and expect that Mr. Sumner will courageously and consistently put a heavy foot on all propositions, from whatever source, ever again to allow the South, under any possible circumstances, to limit "*equality and liberty,*" and "*a republican form of government*" to any class, complexion or race. The South and North together have tried that once, and at a cost too great to repeat the experiment.]

THE leading article in the March number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the strongest of the French political periodicals, is from the pen of M. Forcade, the ablest political writer in its pages. The following is a capital translation of the passage referring to the the speech of Hon. Charles Sumner, Senator in Congress from Massachusetts, on the 5th and 6th of February, on the true meaning of a republican government and the necessity of securing the equal rights of all. The masterly clearness and elegance of the style will attract the attention of the refined reader; but nothing will interest him more than the striking comparison between the memorable speech of M. Thiers in the French Senate, early in February, and that of Mr. Sumner at nearly the same moment. It will be seen that the French, like the American philosopher, recurred to the fountain of republican principles—M. Thiers going back to the sources of the great Revolution, from which all the liberal thinkers and leading minds of succeeding generations in France have drawn their authority, and Mr. Sumner recurring to the teachings of the fathers of American Constitutional liberty to strengthen his hands and guide his steps. As proving how nearly our own struggle for a restored and purified freedom has touched the European mind, the article from the French magazine will be found unusually appropriate and pleasing:

"The noble thoughts which animate M. Thiers give occasion to a parallel which we ask permission to point out. That generous tendency which induces to seek in our revolutionary origin the imprescriptible titles of our liberty is not peculiar to France. An analogous movement is at this very moment going on among those of the most honest and the highest political intelligence of the United States. The very day when M. Thiers delivered his speech we were occupied in reading the remarkable speech which Mr. Sumner has just pronounced in the Senate at Washington, and which the last mail from America has brought us. The speech of Mr. Sumner is the recent political event in the United States.

"The illustrious American Senator, the chief of the Radical party in the Senate, proposed himself to deduce from the most careful examination of the Constitution of his country, those principles according to which should be settled that difficult problem which the Americans call reconstruction—that is to say, the return of the rebel States into the Union. We shall not undertake to judge the practical bearing of the opinions on the great question which agitates the United States. But it is impossible for us not to render homage to the patriotic piety which breathes forth in his beautiful discourse. As M. Thiers wishes to obtain the liberal destinies of France from the great principles of the Revolution, so Mr. Sumner applied himself to exhibit in the origin of the Constitution of the United States the fundamental principles of republican government of modern times.

"It must be seen with what religion Mr. Sumner interrogates the teachings of the founders of the Republic—those whom he constantly calls, the fathers'—touching the language of these republicans, who do not yet date back a century, and who, notwithstanding the rudeness of manners with which we are too inclined to reproach them, carry into their politics the friendly traditions of the family. It must be seen with what honest pride he announces that Washington has given to the world the revelation of a new species of greatness. It must be seen with what sure faith he proclaims the great discovery of the American Revolution, the modern idea of the legitimacy of governments as exclusively founded on the consent of the governed. It must be seen with what abundant and triumphant argumentation he establishes the necessity of equality and liberty, the union of which rounds and completes the circle of American citizenship. 'What,' he cries, 'is equality without liberty, and liberty without equality? And in default of one of these will not the name of Republic be a mockery?'

"Is it not a grand spectacle to witness this concurring return towards the source of liberty and popular government which is going on at the same time in France and in the United States, a country which already, once by our support, has had the happiness and the glory to be our precursor? Is it not a remarkable coincidence that these voices of two great patriots, who, almost at the same moment, without any concert, obey instinctively the mysterious law which moves the people destined to guide civilization, answer to each other with so much splendor from opposite sides of the Atlantic? All the news from the United States shows that the effect produced by the speech of Mr. Sumner has been immense. This success, some one writes, was not attributable to the ordinary seductions of oratory, or to grace of gesture, to elegance of style, or to brilliancy of imagery. It came from the force of truth and the elevation of sentiment. The hearer felt proud under the powerful word of the orator, proud to be a citizen of a government founded on principles so just, so grand, so simple. The habitual adversaries of Mr. Sumner, the Democrats in Congress, covered themselves with honor in uniting in the testimonials of respect which were so universally rendered to the Radical Senator. In the pride inspired by this oratorical fiat the Americans turn in a friendly spirit toward our Old World, and do not dissemble the hope that this speech will do them more honor in Europe than any public act in their country since the decree of emancipation. We are charmed for our part to justify this hope. The pleasant joys of immediate and spontaneous popularity are wanting to those among us who, like M. Thiers, fulfil the severe mission of vindicating public liberties, but the certainty of duty done and the certainty of service performed are sufficient encouragement for vigorous souls."

### *SURSUM CORDA.*

"The French made in 1789, the greatest effort ever made by a people, to cut in two, so to speak, their destiny, and to fix an impassable gulf between what they had hitherto been, and what they would thereafter be. With this aim they have taken all sorts of precautions to import nothing of the past into their new condition; they have imposed all kinds of restraints to make themselves other than their fathers; they forgot nothing that would help make them unrecognizable as the same people. I have always thought that they were much less successful in this brave enterprise than has been believed in foreign countries, and than was at first believed among themselves. I am convinced that they have retained from the old order the greater part of the sentiments, habits, ideas, even with the aid of which they had conducted the Revolution which had destroyed it, and that without their will they had preserved its *debris* to construct the edifice of the new society to such an extent that to comprehend the Revolution and its work, we must forget for a moment the France which we see, and go to interrogate in its tomb the France that is no more."*

THESE remarkable words, coming from one whose authority no American surely can question, have been haunting me so much lately that I begin to fear that they are a warning of what is to come of our own great revolution. Notwithstanding the baptism of our soil with consecrated blood; notwithstanding the dreary tragical experiences of nearly a century; it really seems as if Americans meant to take the *debris* of the old Union—the contempt of the lo vly, the hatred of the negro, the hunger for gold, though coined out of human hearts,—and with these build the new structure. "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" some enthusiastic optimists will cry. Nevertheless, America *did* once declare all men free and equal, and then proceed to sanction the slave trade and the fugitive slave clauses of the Constitution. America began with the Declaration of Independence, but reached at last the Dred Scott decision. These horrible degradations do take place among nations; and if I mistake not, that if we go to the tomb of the old Union we shall find much resemblance between it and that of today. President Johnson occupies precisely the same attitude toward the demand of *his* time, that Buchanan occupied toward the demand of his time. Mr. Raymond is standing in the shoes of Mr. Crittenden. We are now, as then, invited to cement the Union with the blood of the negro. And the same trade which ruled in the old Union; which bought and sold negroes and politicians, cotton and principles, is now trying to barter for its own immediate re-establishment all that the noble blood shed in four years had seemed to gain. For the sake of clamorous trade the "compromises of the Constitution" were made; and it seems that for the same a new Union with similar compromises is to be made. The thunders of Sinai which have published eternal laws to our stricken land have scarcely been hushed, and the golden calf is already worshipped by the crowd. The conflagration that has raged in America for a generation has revealed how much of the house we were living in is perishable material, how much is permanent solid work. It has shown that the inequality of representation in the Senate has made that body an iron band around a tree striving to grow: Connecticut with her few thousands could veto New York with her millions. It has shown that where each representative must live in the district and State he represents, local selfishness and individual self-interest take the place in legislation of public spirit, and that Western adventurers must checkmate the action of cultivated men. It has shown that by the Electoral Colleges less than a fourth of the people would presently elect the President. It has shown that the sweeping out of every officer by each incoming party, kept competent men out of the public business, and filled each department with men intent only on making the most money they could out of the country during their brief stay. It has shown that by the representation of slaves a premium was put upon wrong, and men were empowered to make laws for free men in proportion as they violated the rights of free men. It has shown that each President, by his re-eligibility, has been made with rare exceptions a reckless intriguer for a second term of office; and that the 30,000 offices placed at his disposal were only so much money to bribe politicians to support him. In short, the great conflagration has revealed that the seemingly solid walls about us, were but *stucco* and *terra cotta*,—our oak but veneering,—our decorations shoddy. There is not a thinking man in America but must see that any permanent "reconstruction" must imply a reconstruction of the whole organic law of the country. But what power have thinking men in America? What do Republican Institutions come to if we can never get a first class man into the government,—if the Phillipses, Emersons, Whittiers, Lowells, Sumners, Stevenses, Wades, Schurzes, are to be underfoot? There is nothing sadder under the sun, than to see that which is noble overruled and humiliated by the ignoble.

Now it seems to me that those men in America who acknowledge an allegiance to Reason and Principle, are not doing all they can to save their country from its chronic disgrace and impotence for good. Our thinkers are intent each upon his little home-republic, or engaged in realizing his fools-cap Utopia, and does not apply his mind to public duties. During the height of the storm, all hands came out and worked at the pumps or ropes; but now that the wind abates a little, each returns to his separate affair, and cannot even keep up with the progress of events. We have seen Beecher and many another lose the *elan* which they had during the war, and the enemy sowing the old tares whilst the husbandmen are nodding. In a word there is among our best men a lack of spirit and pluck for their public duties. "All nations," said Dr. South, "that grew great out of little or nothing, did so merely by the public-mindedness of particular persons." There is in America enough brain-power and heart-power to build and guide for grand human results the great machinery of a Republic; but it is now engaged in conducting sectarian churches or reviews. There is a sad lack of public-mindedness amongst our ablest men and best hearts. From this comes the weakness resulting from the serious disagreements of these men, who united, might be irresistible. Why should there be such grievous differences between Phillips and Beecher, Curtis and Greeley, Sumner and Bryant? "Men," said Socrates, "agree in respect to what they know." There is some fact or sign of the time recognized by one which the other has not seen. All men amenable to Reason *must* agree about principles, and about the events and facts which practically represent principles, where they equally perceive and comprehend such events and facts. It is therefore but a trick which prevents our real men in America from seeing eye to eye on the great and formidable issues before us, and consequently prevents their combining to form a power. That which should be settled with all reasonable persons is thus surrendered to be the subject of discussion, when by a little more knowledge, it would be no more a subject of discussion than the sum of two and two.

Now it seems to me that there should be at some central point of the Union—say Cincinnati, or St. Louis—a convention of unofficial liberal men, and the more literary and thinking men in it the better, whose business it should be to come to an understanding as to the position, duty and prospects of America at present. What does reason show to be essential; what does justice demand; what does experience prove to be wrong? Let these questions with their applications be discussed; let every argument be met, every doubt entertained, every popular impression or prejudice be analyzed; and let an impregnable organon of reason and justice be put before the world. The first revolution wrote with pen of fire the "flaming ubiquities" of the Declaration of Independence; before the fire of this second revolution sinks into ashes, it should publish for us a purer law than that. Let every town, village, neighborhood, send a representative to this congress of reason; but let us not imitate the bad system of our government and leave at home the true representative because he is not associated with a special loyality. Wendell Phillips might all the better represent St. Louis, because he is not connected with its petty interests; we need the congressmen of universal laws. There is no reason why representatives should be even confined to the nation; but in such a convention, Mill, Gasparin, Mazzini, and other sworn supporters of the constitution of the universe, and independent of transient dynasties, might well have seats. Nor should men alone engage in such a consultation. It is doubtful if we should ever have been cursed with slavery or war, had the high intuitions and inspired faith of women been adequately represented in government; and no Senate of Humanity could begin by ostracising one half of Humanity. Let delegates be chosen without reference to sex. No true American Congress will ever sit, unless Lucretia Mott, Lydia Maria Child, Mrs. Chapman, Anna Dickinson—or the women who shall follow them, if the true congress is yet to be postponed—shall be in it as equals.

What power would the enactments of such a congress have? Let us not make the ballot-box, nor the policeman, nor the soldier our fetish. The Democrats voted, the Abolitionists did not; which proved stronger? Brooks wielded the bludgeon, Sumner did not; which has prevailed? Let such a congress as I speak of call forth a standing army of clear ideas; let them make justice so plain that only the criminal can demur; let them set forth simple truth, so that the denier can only reveal his long ears. There are scattered through the woods and fields of America millions of men and women in every heart of whom God hath set His witness and friend; they are now hearing uncertain and discordant bugle-calls on every side; they run now with Doolittle, now with Wade, now with the

*From the Preface to De Tocqueville's "*L'ancien Regime et la Revolution.*"

*Evening Post*, now with the *Tribune*; and thus the very army of God in America is demoralized, and may presently be utterly routed. Commercial selfishness, political ambition, sentimental compromises—by all these have the people been deceived, and they have ended in giving to each house its dead; on the funeral hush, and anxious questioning of millions of honest men and women, let the breath of all true spirits sound the trumpet of God, and these will know which is the true government of America, and none other will be able to resist it.—*Moncure D. Conway, in the Boston Radical.*


# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1866.


### ANNUAL MEETING.

THE Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the City of NEW YORK, at the Church of the Puritans, on Union Square, on TUESDAY, May 8th, at 10 o'clock. In the evening, there will be another public meeting at 7½ o'clock.

The meetings will be addressed by WENDELL PHILLIPS, LUCRETIA MOTT, CHARLES LENOX REMOND, Rev. J. T. SARGENT, Rev. O. B. FROTHINGHAM, PARKER PILLSBURY, and others.

On Wednesday morning at ten o'clock, the Society and its friends will hold a session for business, in the lecture room of the same church.

The rights of the Negro are to day in more fearful peril than at any period since the first fire on Sumter. We appeal to the friends of freedom to come together and see what may be and should be done to strengthen the hands and hearts of those who are fighting his battle.

In behalf of the Executive Committee.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, Pres.

C. K. WHIPPLE, A. M. POWELL, } Secretaries.

### *TO DO, OR NOT TO DO.*

SIR JAMES MACINTOSH'S "Defence of the French Revolution against the attacks of Edmund Burke," contains the following:

"Power vegetates with more vigor after *gentle* prunings. A slender reform amuses and lulls the people; the popular enthusiasm subsides; and the moment of effectual reform is irretrievably lost. No important political improvement was ever obtained in a period of tranquillity. If the effervescence of the popular mind is suffered to pass away without effect, it would be absurd to expect from langnor what enthusiasm has not obtained. If radical reform is not, at such a moment, procured, all partial changes are evaded and defeated in the tranquillity which succeeds. Whatever excellence, whatever freedom is discoverable in governments, has been infused into them by the shock of a revolution; and their subsequent progress has been only the accumulation of abuse. It is hence that the most enlightened politicians have recognised the necessity of irrequently recalling their first principles;—a truth equally suggested to the penetrating intellect of Machiavel, by his experience of the Florentine democracy, and by his research into the history of ancient commonwealths. Whatever is good ought to be pursued at the moment it is attainable. The public voice, irresistible in a period of convulsion, is contemned with impunity, when spoken during the lethargy into which nations are lulled by the tranquil course of their ordinary affairs. The ardor of reform languishes in unsupported tediousness; it perishes in an impotent struggle with adversaries, who receive new strength with the progress of the day. No hope of great political improvement—let us repeat it—is to be entertained from tranquillity."

Nature, scripture, history, philosophy, all teach the danger of delay in the discharge of duties, personal or national. "Execute justice in the morning," was a high command. In the morning, means early: the first thing. No work, no worship, no sacrifice, no prayer is acceptable, or available to procure any good thing, while justice waits undone and righteousness is unfulfilled.

Attempting to restore the government, Congress and the President find themselves a divided union, also needing reconstruction. But at present the prayer of the people particularly of color, might well be, to be delivered from the power and the policy of both. The President denies that the Union is or can be broken. His policy, therefore, is one rather of recognition than reconstruction. The rebellion and war he regards as a mere whiff of smoke on a polished mirror, to be sponged off by a few executive proclamations. The plenitude of the pardoning power has released all the chiefs of the rebellion but the supreme head; and he is believed out of danger.

Congress sees more difficulties. It counsels delay. So there is danger on both hands. For it is more a moral than a political work they have in hand. Evidently the presidential policy is all wrong; a downright injustice. Congress has really no plan, except to wait. "*Their strength is to sit still;*" for which they have Hebrew precedent, but one not often pursued, we may hope; never applauded as wisdom or statesmanship. "Members are leaving quietly," the papers tell us, for their homes on short leave; intending to return, it is said, and *sit* it out on that line if it takes all Summer. The product it is hoped of such protracted incubation will at least be a fortunate brood of State elections during Autumn. Members of the Cabinet are entreated not to resign, we are farther assured, lest their places be supplied by presidential sycophants.

And yet, on the one vital question involved in restoring the government, there is no positive disagreement between the two powers. With both, "a republican form of government" means substantially the same—means, as it has ever in our nation, a lie—means what each State made it mean. It was the same thing in the North as in the South. Half the human race disfranchised on account of sex, everywhere; a large proportion, almost everywhere, on account of color. The Federal government accepted and approved what the States decreed. When the Constitution was framed and the Union formed, colored men were voters everywhere, excepting in South Carolina. And in New Jersey women also voted, and long after. Afterwards, slavery began to banish color from the ballot-box. The ungodly example was followed, even in some of the New England States. And no new State could be admitted to the Union but on a white suffrage basis. So were interpreted the words of the Constitution—"The United States shall guarantee to each State a republican form of government!" The States gave and guaranteed the Federal government a despotism the most odious the world had known—a despotism based on complexion. The Federal government gave the States nothing.

Congress, last December, found slavery in form abolished; and it was universally hoped, if not believed, that with it would perish all its types, shadows, relics and remembrances. Even the New York *Herald* saw that to be the hope and faith; and made haste to declare and defend and even glorify the stupendous achievement. And thus reconstruction seemed to be maturing, as was once said of a popular Presidential election, by *spontaneous combustion!* It was as when Gen. Fremont abolished slavery in his military district. The very morning stars seemed singing together, and liberty and good will to men were the theme and song. At the South, through all the realm of slavery, everywhere, were heard only the howlings of rage and the wailings of despair. The one vulnerable spot, the heel of the dread Achilles, had been discovered. But the proclamation was revoked; its author was dishonored and removed from command. Slavery was to be sacred on both sides alike. And so onward swept the tornado of war, through more than two thousand battles and four dreary years. The government had power and right to crush slavery and the rebellion at a blow. It was a solemn duty to strike that blow by following the example of Fremont and proclaiming liberty throughout all the land. Justice demanded it. God commanded it. Interest and duty, policy and principle, all combined in it. But the government failed. The consequences we know. They are read in the wrinkling hieroglyphs of half-a-million untimely graves, in terrible stereotype all over the land!

And now the same fatal philosophy rules in the governmental councils. We conceded to slavery its right to be and to rule, when its iron hand was clutching at the nation's heart strings. And we now define a Republican form of government to mean an aristocracy of the skin. Even slavery we protect by our very Constitutional Amendment, if it be made *a penalty for crime;* and provide for, or at least make possible a Pariah system, as infamous and oppressive as ever flourished on the banks of the Ganges.

Congress began well but failed in persistency. That grace was monopolized by the President. In the dead lock between them he yields nothing. His speeches grow more and more determined and defiant. Congress is giving the question of suffrage back to the States where he always placed it. But beyond that, is the greater or prior injustice. Traitors black within and bloody all over with murder, are restored to the right of life, liberty, property, prerogative, dignity, all that constitutes the sovereignty and glory of citizenship. But loyal, brave, noble men, black only without, are still proscribed and ruled by their old tyrants.

Meanwhile the President is said to be providing for a re-election. Few deny, or appear to doubt it. Congress and the party in power are equally industrious as a Committee of Ways and Means, to prolong their existence, reckless of principle. The press publishes papers to sell not save the nation. The people are tired of the contest and weariness is ever demoralizing. The church and clergy, a small part excepted, are busy with their revivals, and have no adequate voice of warning as they had not years ago, when silence was crime. They communed with their Southern brethren at their thousands of sacramental tables, almost a hundred years, slave-breeding, slave-trading and slaveholding being no bar to Christian fellowship! Then at the call of the State, they rose up and slaughtered each other in a four years war, and are now ready, all unrepentant, to rush again into each other's embrace with loves as fervent and unclean too as between the Sythians and the Amazons, after their battle in ancient story. The political newspapers herald the number of new converts, thus aiding to bewilder the public vision; rejoicing that while thus occupied, the church and ministers are not at least rebuking their iniquity nor exposing their unhallowed devices. The Abolitionists, many of them, accepted the war as the death and funeral of slavery; and weary with a mission (who can wonder?) which was almost thirty years martyrdom, surrendered their God-given commission, and retired behind the armed legions of war; even while commanders were tendering their swords and soldiers to cut down loyal and patriotic slaves, who should presume to imitate La Fayette, in wishing to aid on the cause of freedom; and while both armies seemed to hold slavery as the sacred shield, on the preservation of which hung all the hope of empire; and while the South fought alone for slavery, and the North for a Union with slaveholders.

Out of this condition of our national affairs grows the necessity of the longer continuance of the Anti-Slavery Society and its instrumentalities. We lost incalculably during the war and afterwards by wickedly refusing to do justice. That alone, cost blood and treasure yet unknown. And still the government delays. No inspiration is more true than the declarations at the head of this article. Procrastination in a work like theirs must be ruin. The people must lose heart and conscience. A nation is only as an individual. A financial crash now would complete the destruction. And the power to produce even this is doubtless in the presidential control. There is but a step between the nation to-day and the condition of an individual when in desperation he balances between the decanter of the drunkard, the pistol of the highwayman, or the phial of the suicide; and perhaps at last enters the valley and shadow of death through all three of these dismal gates. Individuals have done it and will again. So too have nations and will again.

Only truth and justice can save. For more than thirty years the Abolitionists declared this to an atheistic church, government and people. To their utterances God at length added the seven thunders of war. Still the nation does not believe, is not saved. Let the Abolitionists be profoundly impressed with this solemn consideration, and rally to the Anniversary just at hand, with a devotion of spirit and earnestness of purpose, if possible unknown even to them before.

**Anniversary.**—In answer to inquiries relative to rooms and board in the vicinity of Dr. Cheever's church, we would say, almost the entire south side of Fourteenth street, between Broadway and Fifth avenue, is occupied with boarding-houses, and the square surrounded with hotels. Several of them are on the European plan. Then there are the Irving House, corner of Broadway and Twelfth street; the St. Dennis, corner of Broadway and Eleventh street; and lower down town, the International, Earl's Hotel, corner of Canal and Centre streets, and Lovejoy's, in Park Row—all on the European plan. Good places, too, are Dr. Taylor's, corner of Sixth avenue and Thirty-eighth street, and Dr. Miller's, No. 15 Laight street.

ANOTHER PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH.—The Roxbury *Journal* says the address of Mr. Johnson to the colored men on Thursday was worthy only of the smallest and meanest demagogues that figure in American politics. We have striven to find more polite words in which to justly characterize it, but the attempt is a failure. Mr. Johnson's sins against dignity, decency and respectability in his high office are much worse than his lack of political orthodoxy, bad as this last may be. The *Journal* thinks the richest thing about the speech is when he asked "What is the veto power?" and a voice in the crowd responded "To put down the nagur." That appears to be just about the President's idea of it.

**Anna E. Dickinson.**—We are authorized to say by our friend Miss Dickinson that she hopes to attend the anniversary meetings;—both Anti-Slavery and Woman's Rights.

### *PROBABLE PLAN OF RECONSTRUCTION.*

A WASHINGTON dispatch in yesterday's *Evening Post* states that a majority of the Reconstruction Committee have agreed to adopt the plan of reconstruction proposed by Robert Dale Owen. The accounts from Washington generally seem to favor the statement of the *Post.* The following is the plan of Mr. Owen. It is in the form of an amendment to the Constitution, consisting of the following sections:

SECTION 1. All discriminations among the people of the United States because of race, color, or previous condition, in respect to their civil rights, are hereafter prohibited.

SEC. 2. On and after the 4th of July, 1876, all male adult citizens of twenty-one years of age, irrespective of race or color, shall be endowed with the right of suffrage at all elections, Federal as well as State.

SEC. 3. Representation in Congress, as electors for President and Vice-President until the 4th of July, 1866, shall be based on the number of male adult citizens entitled to exercise the right of suffrage by the laws of the respective States; but after that period representation shall be based on the whole population.

SEC. 4. Obligations and liabilities incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion, and claims for compensation on account of emancipation of slaves, are void, and shall not be assumed nor paid by any State or the United States.

Accompanying this plan and forming a part of it, is the following joint resolution:

*Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That whenever any one of the eleven States whose inhabitants were lately in insurrection, through its Legislature, having been first authorized so to do by a popular vote of its present electors, to vote under the laws thereof as they existed in 1860, shall have ratified the foregoing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and shall have modified its Constitution and laws in conformity therewith, then, in that case, such State shall be recognized as having fully and validly resumed its former relations with this government, and its chosen Representatives shall be admitted into the two Houses of the National Legislature; *Provided,* that such Senators and Representatives shall possess all the qualifications required by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

### *NOTICES OF BOOKS.*

A HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND, from the discovery by Europeans to the revolution of the 17th century; being an abridgment of his "History of New-England during the Stuart Dynasty." By John Gorham Palfrey. In two volumes. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF SLAVERY IN MASSACHUSETTS. By George H. Moore. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

THE lion said in the fable that when lions wrote history they would have a better name in the world. New England has reached that coveted period. Her lions make her history and write it too. Old England had her Macaulay at length; New England has her Palfrey already. Travellers in Old England are amazed at the tomes of history everywhere encountered, but of which, however learned, they had never heard. Not a town of importance but has many ponderous volumes of its own, written as the generations have swept on, and it has slowly grown like the oaks of the realm, in all the varied structures of the language, back to and through the period of the Saxon kings. All these volumes, and even libraries of volumes, are wholly independent of the great historical works familiar to scholars, and which have made their authors and the empire famous. And yet it is often said the history of England is yet to be written. Even Mr. Carlyle so declared in substance, at his late inauguration in Edinburgh. So, doubtless, thought Buckle, and set himself about it, after his method, with a *do or die* determination. And die he did, leaving even the foundations of the stupendous fabric he had designed, scarcely half laid. And so the true historian of England has perhaps yet to appear.

Travellers in America, our New Europe, for such the country must soon become, are equally surprised at another phenomenon, and that is the rapidity with which we *make* history. One man asked another, "Have you read the Pilgrim's Progress?" The answer was "No; but I am making it." And we are making the history and renewing the experiences of sixty centuries in our one nation and government, almost in that number of single years.

New England is fortunate in her Secretary and Recorder. Old England waited a thousand years for her Macaulay; but New England has found hers in John Gorham Palfrey, in her third century. One valuable consideration in Mr. Palfrey's books is, that they are within the reach of all who have any reasonable ambitio to possess them. In England they talk of pounds; we reckon by dollars; and a pound is five dollars. But a dollar ten years ago, would buy in this country almost as good a book as a pound would then or now in Great Britain.

Mr. Palfrey writes with the partiality of a fond and faithful son; and particularly when he treats of his native Massachusetts, and her relations to the Indian and African slave trade and slavery. His own personal record in respect to that iniquitous system, is not only most honorable to himself, but highly complimentary to human nature. And so he has earned the right to be jealous for the State of his birth and that of his ancestors, as far as the stern facts of history will allow. Daniel Webster said of Massachusetts, "her past at least is secure." She holds Plymouth Rock and Faneuil Hall; Concord, Lexington and Bunker Hill. Her household words are Otis and Warren, Hancock and the house of Adams. She needed not therefore to establish her fame, that Mr. Sumner should say in 1854 that "in all her annals, no person was ever born a slave on the soil of Massachusetts, nor held by sanction of any statute law of colony or commonwealth;" nor that Mr. Palfrey should at a subsequent period attempt to confirm the great mistake, by affirming that "no person was ever born into legal slavery in Massachusetts," unless the same is true of every State in the Union.

The error of statement respecting slavery in Massachusetts and some other New England States is most faithfully shown in the Notes on Slavery by Mr. Moore, Librarian of the New York Historical Society, and Corresponding Member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. More patient and impartial research could not have well been given to any work, than Mr. Moore has brought to his. A devotee himself to history as a science, a disciple of all its masters, modern and ancient, with facilities for discovery, investigation and comparison second to none at least in America, he surely is entitled to be heard with the largest respect and attention. He has at least the same investment in the integrity of history, that Mr. Palfrey has in the honor of Massachusetts; guarding the gates of her paradise that nothing which defileth or maketh a lie shall enter there. And it is fully shown from abundant articles and advertisements in the newspapers of the time, from the reports and decisions of courts, from the action of legislative bodies, from private correspondence preserved, from books whose titles at least are still extant and frequently cited, and from the missionary labors of Benjamin Lay and other anti-slavery men against the system, that slavery, including the trade both foreign and domestic, and most of the cruelties and abominations ever incident to the system, were as real and substantial in Boston a hundred years ago, as they are to-day in the streets of Havana. And to confirm the whole, the evidence is unmistakable that the most eminent clergy of that period defended the abomination from the Scriptures, with an unction worthy of many of their successors in more modern times.

After all Mr. Palfrey has done a work for the youth of New England and for all her people, not to be over-estimated. And it is earnestly to be hoped that he may live many years yet and bear much more fruit of his kind. His disposal of a patrimony of slaves several years since, by bringing them to New England as soon as they were conveyed to him, setting them at liberty and providing them the means of self-support, when he also was living by the sweat of industry, won for him the admiring gratitude of every friend of freedom and of man.

We had marked several passages from both works, intending to add them to this article; but space forbids. Another week will do. Meantime we wish the Publishers large sales of these valuable contributions to history.

### *PERSONAL.*

Mrs. Jefferson Davis, attended by three servants, passed through Burlington a few days since on her way to Montreal.

The widow of Rev. T. Starr King was married in New York last week to Mr. Norris, a rich steamboat man of San Francisco, and an intimate friend of her husband.

Hon. Thaddeus Stevens was born in Caledonia County, Vermont, on the 4th day of April, 1793. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1814, and then removed to Pennsylvania.

George Cruikshank is now seventy-six years of age, and a committee of which John Ruskin is president, has been formed in London to present him a testimonial.

The Albany Evening *Journal* says: Maj.-Gen. John A. McClernand, of Illinois, has written a letter, in which he expresses the hope that the Southern representatives elected to Congress will force their claims to admission, "peaceably if they can, but forcibly if they must."

Gen. Robert E. Lee is expected in Washington in a few days, and his friends are making due preparations to show him marked attention. Mayor-elect Monroe, and Alderman-elect Nixon of New-Orleans, who have not been permitted to exercise their functions on account of their connection with the Rebellion, are also at the capitol suing, and successfully too, for their pardons.

A Correspondent of the New York *Tribune* writing from Norfolk says: "A curious statement was made to him in private conversation a few days since by an ex-Rebel officer of Stonewall Jackson's command. Speaking of Jackson, he said that if Jackson had been in command of the Rebel army after the battle of Antietam the war would have been brought to a close. This statement I was anxious to know the reason of.

"Jackson proposed to Lee and other officers that McClellan should be delicately approached with a proposition to place him (McClellan) in command of both the Union and Rebel armies, and then dictate to the Administration satisfactory terms for peace, which at that time would have been the deposing of Mr. Lincoln;" but Jeff. Davis got wind of the plan and it fell through. "We thought that the United States government had become aware of such a plan, and that was the way that we accounted for the fact of McClellan being relieved from the command of the army."

The Fort Sumter Club, in Brooklyn celebrated its first Anniversary on the 14th by a public dinner. Mr. Garrison was invited and responded by letter, a part of which reads thus:

"Andrew Johnson might have placed his name high on the roll of the illustrious and world-renowned benefactors of the human race; but, by his evil and treacherous course, his usurping and despotic policy in the interests of those who are still rebels in spirit and purpose, his perfidy as their *soi-disant* 'Moses' toward the liberated bondmen of the South, he seems bent upon sending his name down to posterity along with those of Benedict Arnold and Judas Iscariot. For what is the meaning of the jubilant shouts heard throughout rebeldom, and vociferously responded to by the entire body of Northern Copperheads, in view of his liberty-crushing vetoes, but that he is on their side and acting in accordance with their wishes, and therefore false to his oath of office, and recreant to all that is sacred in justice and precious in liberty? Allow me, therefore, to offer you the following cold-water sentiment:

"*The speedy impeachment and removal of Andrew Johnson from the office he dishonors and betrays.*

"Yours, for the execution of justice,

"WM. LLOYD GARRISON."

Much has been said of late about the part Senator Wilson bore in the release of Clement C. Clay. The following letter shows:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER, WASHINGTON, March 3, 1866.

*To His Excellency the President of the United States:*

SIR: Mrs. Clay, the wife of Clement C. Clay, is now in the city, and has requested me to obtain permission for her husband to go to his home on parole. His father is said to be at the point of death, his mother recently deceased, and if there be no objections or reasons unknown to me why the request of Mrs. Clay should be denied, I have no hesitation in recommending the favorable consideration, if only from motives of humanity, as I have no doubt Mr. Clay will be forthcoming when his presence is again required by the government. I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

H. WILSON.

A correspondent of the New York *Times* who appears to be booked on the subject says: Those who seek to make it appear that Senator Wilson wishes to modify or take back anything contained in this letter do him great injustice. Mr. Wilson long since advised the President to release all the rebel leaders who are held upon charge of treason, and he has no reason now for changing his opinion on that subject, the motives which prompt him in making this recommendation are such as should commend themselves to at least the calm consideration of all well disposed citizens, and will on a fitting occasion be made known by Senator Wilson himself.

## Our Boston Correspondence.

BOSTON, April 23d, 1866.

I HOPE you will give the readers of THE STANDARD Whittier's lines (in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May) describing Abraham Davenport, an old worthy of Connecticut in the last century. The subject and the execution of these verses are alike admirable. The firm and quiet old legislator—resisting the proposal of his brother Representatives to adjourn when the famous "dark day" of 1780 came, and resisting it expressly on the ground that if it was, as they feared, "the last great day," all the more should he and they be found doing the *duty* belonging to their station—stands in fine contrast with Dr. South-side Adams, of whose advice to his church (in view of the possible coming, any morning, of the day of judgment) I told you a few weeks ago. The best counsel that this veteran preacher had to give in preparation for such a possibility—speaking, be it observed, to his church-members, persons already "redeemed, justified and sanctified"—was to seek one further security for their own precious skins by a "renewal of their covenant." Truly, there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous. But such is the tendency of the system which Parson Adams preaches. It is, substantially, an extension of the idea of "looking out for No. 1" to the next stage of existence; a continuation of worldliness into "other-worldliness;" an effort to obtain a safe "fire insurance policy" for after death; and all this resting not only on a mere assumption, a theory unproved, but a theory at once irreverent to God and demo

in such a town a "business-man," in another "an eminent lawyer," in another "a rich lady," a votary of fashion and pleasure (with her husband do. do.), who were unspeakably amazed to find themselves regenerated on such short notice, and with so little trouble or disturbance, after one or two interviews with him. Of course, therefore, he has numerous applications to go to various places where they are hoping or wishing for a revival. Very recently he had received a letter from Amos Kendall, asking for help towards a revival existing or expected in his vicinity; but he would not now leave Boston. "God has a great blessing for Boston at this time." He (Mr. Earle) never came to a place with stronger faith than he came there that very morning. All that was necessary was that his audience should have faith also, and the windows of heaven would be opened while that very meeting was in session.

The phrase last used suggests another of the most effective of his methods of operation, namely, the habit of demanding, after he has excited the confidence, the sympathy and the vivid emotion of more or fewer of his hearers, some immediate *manifestation* of their state of feeling, so that, having "committed themselves," they may not only feel internally impelled to take further steps in the same direction, but may mark themselves, in view of the church-members watching around them, as subjects for special supervision and solicitation. His great point is to get individuals in the audience to rise and ask prayers for themselves as lost and perishing sinners. After various and varied repetitions of this request, so as to secure all who can be persuaded to take this step, he tries for the next grade of susceptibility, inviting all who wish for "the prayers of God's people" (he and his, be it observed, are "God's people,") to leave their seats and come and kneel down before the pulpit, in silent token of making the same request. After dwelling upon this for awhile, and mentioning those who at intervals comply with it as examples for the encouragement of others, until all have come who will venture, he asks any others who have the same desire to come out of their pews and kneel in the aisle adjacent. When this has been done, he requests any others cherishing the same wish to kneel in their places in the pews, and further that all church-members present who have special prayers to make for individuals will do the same. Having thus got a considerable portion of the audience "committed," he kneels himself and prays, or asks the assembly to unite first with brother so-and-so, and then with himself in prayer.

The enumeration of these particulars is so insufficient to show the tact with which, like a skilful auctioneer, he seizes upon little present circumstances to keep the attention and interest of his audience on the stretch, throws in little encouraging and stimulating remarks, and waits to give the timid or the undecided one more chance—that I will sketch, in their order, the things actually said after a particular sermon in which he had vehemently aroused the hopes and fears of his audience. It is to be noticed that his gatherings consist, in a very large proportion, of women, and that a very great proportion of the manifestations of emotion come from them.

After speaking, at the close of the discourse, of the great desirableness of open "committal" of themselves by persons "under concern," he asked—"Will any one now make a request for prayers? Is there not one here who desires the help of the prayers of God's people?" (Two women rise in different parts of the house, and seem to be making requests.) "Speak louder, we want to have these requests distinctly heard." (Other individuals rise.) "God keeps his secretary here to note down all these requests." (More show themselves.) "Go on, and let God hear you. This is Christ's spirit manifesting itself." (Several others speak.) "I'll wait a minute or two longer." (Some others rise.) "I don't know as we can spend any more time." (More requests are made.) "If there is one in the house that desires now, at this moment, to find the Saviour precious, let him rise." (Several stand up.) "Oh, what a precious time is this." (More requests are made.) "I want to go down there before the pulpit and kneel, and if any others wish to come there and kneel, let them come." (Several advance and kneel, and a lay assistant strikes up the hymn "Come to Jesus, *just now.*") "Now kneel anywhere in the house, just where you can find room"—and then after prayer, the announcement of future meetings, and the request that those who wished more intimate conference with the speaker would remain, the audience was dismissed.

This was encouraging, and a less experienced person might have acquiesced in the diminished attendance and amount of demonstration that came on a subsequent day (when the East wind blew), as showing that natural commencement of decline in the revival which must sooner or later be expected. But here Mr. Earle showed anew his competence for the post of director. He pitched vigorously into the church-members and the ministers (who had seemed to your correspondent to be seconding him in a vigorous manner) telling them that any failure now would be their fault; that they were taking matters altogether too easily; that souls could not be born into the kingdom without pain, and that they (the ministers and church-members) must be in "an agony of supplication" if they would see any further results; they had not yet an adequate feeling of the terrible intensity of God's wrath. It had formerly been shown among the angels. When the angels ran up the rebel flag in heaven, God immediately put them in chains, millions of them, and threw them over the battlements, and they remained in chains still. The cup of God's wrath is a bitter cup, a *very* bitter cup. There's an eternal hell in which to drink the bitter cup of God's wrath. Think of *your* husband, of *your* son, condemned to this hell. We cannot hope for a revival here unless Christians are in an agony. If you could spend one hour with a sinner in the depths of hell you would know the state of mind needed for this work. It was the ministers, the church officers and the church-members whose labors were most needed in a revival. A Fall River minister had said to him—"As soon as I've got my deacons and church members into working order I want *you* to come." This was the true method. The churches themselves must throw themselves more heartily into the work. This precious revival of religion is soon to pass by unless we have more agonizing prayer.

Rev. Dr. Kirk promptly seconded this view of the matter, declaring that "ordinary prayers could not be expected to produce *extraordinary* results," and urging the brethren to comply with the suggestion made; and Mr. Earle followed up his blow by praying—(the prayers on these occasions, as on Sundays, are addressed to men quite *as much* as to God)—"If we need to go to the church or the household and make confession of our past lukewarmness, help us to do it. If we need to go to the store, or the office or the shop and make confession, may we have help to do it."

So the next portion of the programme is that there is to be an immediate and more thorough sharpening of the tools, "as iron sharpeneth iron." The ministers, deacons and church-members are to labor for a revival harder than they did before. They are to pray more earnestly, attend the meetings more constantly, and be more assiduous in beseeching their unconverted friends and acquintances to go also. The distribution of tracts will be increased, the importunancy of private solicitation will be increased, the reports of current results in the "religious" papers—and the daily press will be increased, and (according to the natural relation between seed time and harvest) greater results are naturally to be expected. The revival people recognize this law thoroughly during the working period. The churches of Boston, and their deacons, and their ministers, have all been vigorously acting upon it for three months past, and they will act upon it yet more vigorously for some weeks to come. But when the natural result arrives, all these people, with one consent, will set up a shout—"This is *the Lord's* doing! Not unto us, not unto us," etc. etc., When this shall come to pass, be not amazed, and do not impute intentional dishonesty to the great mass of the people who raise this cry! It is part of the system. The theory which they blindly follow, trusting in the truth and honesty of their leaders, absolutely demands it of them. NORTH.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS IN HUNGARY.—A curious petition has been presented to the Hungarian Diet. It is signed by a number of widows and other women who are landed proprietors, and asks for them the same equality of political rights with the male inhabitants of the country as they possessed in 1848. These ladies represent that they have much more difficulty in bringing up their children and attending to their estates than men, that they have to bear the same State burdens, that they are not allowed to take part in the communal elections, and that, although many of them possess much more ground than the male electors, they have no political rights.

## Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, April 22, 1866.

*To the Editor of the Standard:*

THE approach of warm weather and the shortened evenings remind us that the lecture season draws to a close. With pleasure and satisfaction we recur to the Winter's entertainment in Concert Hall, and many thanks are due to the Association whose enterprise and practical appreciation of good influences have brought us face to face with champions of political reform, and teachers in the field of enlightened progressive sentiment. Through the agency of this Association of colored people, a good part has been performed in the great work before the nation. A deep interest has been shown by the people of their own race, and by awakening among them higher thoughts and aspirations, and kindling desires for social, political, and general growth, substantial benefits have been largely conferred. May the Association continue to resort to this elevated source of improvement, not only for their own good, but for that of the public likewise, and we shall witness a gradual disappearance of the old prejudice, and a free and honest recognition of their claim to a place among the foremost in God's household. Let the wretched arguments of a vulgar public be undermined and swept away, and, where reason and fact, wisdom, good sense and justice all inveigh against them, they will relinquish their foolish position from a simple consciousness of the ridicule which their attitude invites.

The Banneker Institute of this city is another association composed of colored gentlemen, for mutual literary improvement. Under its direction a lecture was given to the public on last Thursday evening by John W. Forney. This gentleman received a generous and enthusiastic welcome from the vast audience gathered in Concert Hall, and the fine success attending this first effort of the Institute to entertain the public, will encourage them, we trust, to repeat the worthy action in the future.

Mr. Forney's lecture was an answer to the inquiry—"Has the War for Human Freedom been fought in vain?" The first portion of the address was a revival of the recollections that make April, 1861, historic. An interesting and compact narration of events was given, including a minute account of Mr. Lincoln's passage from Harrisburg to Washington, and the plans laid by the villainous rebels to encompass him at Baltimore, and by a high-handed act of murder, to put a sudden end to his career.

In referring to the session of the Thirty-Sixth Congress in December, 1860, he remarked there was no page in the early records of the rebellion that reflects more credit upon human character than the manner in which the insolent domination of the Southern leaders was met by the statesmen sent there from the loyal North. "Had Southern malediction been answered by Northern malediction—had the bitter brutality of Wigfall, the satanic sneer of Slidell, the Judas stab of Benjamin, the bitter taunt of Mason, been answered or resented on the spot, their subsequent revolt would not have shocked the civilized world, as it did, by its causeless and unprovoked atrocities. It was ordained that all the provocation should be on the side of the slave-tyrant; that he who struck at the image of American liberty should strike without excuse, and that even as the traitor's dagger was raised to plunge into the heart of the Republic, her breast should almost be bared to his blow."

He introduced Andrew Johnson in this wise: "I know the solicitude that pervades the country at the present moment. It is a strange and unexpected and horrible distrust—unnatural, revolting, and inexplicable by any ordinary process of reasoning. But the very fact that the man who promised everything is forgetting everything; who was accepted as the successor of Lincoln, and has attempted to be the destroyer of his labors, and who, having enjoyed an affluent popular confidence, armed with imperial weapons, and capable of using almost despotic power for the salvation of the country, has attempted to abuse this confidence, and to turn these weapons against the generous and trusting bosom of a great people, *this very fact, this attempt, has made him powerless for evil.* There is no sterner and more terrible evidence of the truth that this war has not been fought in vain than the pitiable spectacle of Andrew Johnson to-day."

The position assumed by the speaker towards the colored people was one of large and unqualified liberality. He declared that the end of discrimination and distinctions is as sure as the end of slavery; that it would be as futile for politicians to set themselves against it, as for either of us to seek to cheat the grave, or to tell to-day where we shall be a year hence. He proclaimed himself unhesitatingly in favor of conferring the ballot upon the colored citizen, calling it absurd to denounce the proposition of universal suffrage. Unconsciously to himself, yes, even as he clamors against the work of destiny, said the speaker, our Presidential Moses is conferring the rights of citizens upon the colored people by laboring to return all the rights of citizenship to the men who first attempted to make him odious to all mankind, and then assassinated the illustrious Lincoln.

"We are being wonderfully prepared," remarked the speaker, "for the results of universal emancipation, viz.: universal equality and universal suffrage. The moral revolution in the United States may almost be called a grand religious revival. The destruction of long-cherished heresies is followed by the acceptance of long-repudiated doctrines. The emancipation of four millions of human beings has vitalized and given occupation to thousands of energies that have lain dormant for many years. As the philanthropic and religious societies educate the colored masses, they excite the rivalry of the Southern whites, and awaken a generous co-operation among the benevolent people of the North. Thus, that which was intended to leaven the ignorance of the oppressed and degraded multitudes of the Southern States, leavens society in the concrete, and carries its humanizing influence into every corner of the land."

Here is another forcible passage from the lips of this eloquent speaker: "Sometimes, as I study the progress of bigotry and prejudice on these great questions, I almost doubt the existence of human reason. How common it is as you pass along the streets to hear the oppressed and persecuted colored people jeered at and assailed by grown men and women, and by the children they rear. When it was proposed to allow them to travel in our city cars, disgraceful tumults punished the audacious attempt. But such intolerance cannot last. That it is dying out rapidly, and that an incalculable advance has been made by the truth within a very few years, are triumphs which cannot be too frequently celebrated. That the end will be the complete extirpation of all such passions and prejudices is sure. Not long can these objections stand before the fact that it was not a black man who attempted to set fire to the city of New York during the rebellion; that they were not black men who enforced the infernal cruelties upon our prisoners at Libby, at Andersonville and at Belle Isle; that it was not a black man who assassinated Ellsworth at Alexandria; that they were not black men who poured out of the stifling dens and alleys at Baltimore, and assailed the 6th Massachusetts regiment; and finally, that they were not black men who arranged the murder of Abraham Lincoln, and that the hand that made the vacancy now filled by Andrew Johnson was not that of an American negro. These barbarities were the work of men, some of whom are now living in the South, and under the policy of Andrew Johnson will enjoy the right of suffrage at the coming elections."

One more paragraph let me quote from this lecture: "An outcry, originating among those who hatched wordy treason into rebellious war, has gone through the land, like the vengeful groan of guilty spirits, 'that eleven States are kept out of the Union by the Radicals in Congress.' Echoed by all the sympathizers with the traitors in the North, it was finally responded to in a special message from the Presidential mansion. Oh, burden hard to bear! that men who toiled and fought through four years of fire and blood, and death, to destroy the only free Government in the world, and who filled their record with inconceivable shame and savagery, should be detained a few short months from the enjoyment of fuller rights than those they forfeited, and from the complete control of the nation whose life they madly sought to take! As I watch their insolent impatience and hear their blasphemous denunciations of patriotic men, because they are not immediately permitted to rule my country, I turn to and gather instruction and admonition from a different spectacle—from the long and grievous oppression under which four millions of human beings suffered, without murmur, without protest, and without revolution, at the hands of these urgent and importunate petitioners. No sin could be laid at the door of the poor slave man except that he was black. *His* dreams were not tortured with murder and assassination, with ingratitude to a generous government, and with hatred to an intelligent and Christian people. Yet through years of agony and stripes his race has suffered, and suffered not alone without complaint, but under the sanction of law and with the authority of men of God. And shall not the persecutors and oppressors of this race, when to slavery they added secession, to secession rebellion, and to rebellion assassination, be delayed a little while before they are welcomed back into the high places of power, and before we resign into their hands, all stained with precious blood, the reins of a mighty government?"

Such was the spirit and character of Mr. Forney's oration, embodying the most radical ideas, animated by the most generous feeling, and gathering its inspiration from the most exalted sentiments of a progressive and comprehensive liberality. Its most extreme expressions elicited the heartiest applause. Its tender of broad, benevolent, and unreserved sympathy with the colored race, was greeted with emphatic responses of approval. Its herald of the inevitable dawn of universal equality awoke a sublime ecstacy of hopeful fervor, and kindled a living joy like that which springs from the announcement of glad tidings. O.

PHILADELPHIA, April 18, 1866.

*To the Editor of the Standard:*

DEAR SIR: The following clever adaptation of a familiar nursery song was written shortly after the 22d of February last, by a lady who has actually lived under every administration of our Government, from that of George Washington down, down, down to this of Andrew Johnson. GRACE GREENWOOD.

### AN ADAPTATION OF AN OLD SONG.

There was once a live Duck,
A-sitting on an oak—
He was spied by a Tailor
Cutting out a black cloak;
The duck was a "game bird,"
With a flock at his back,
And loud he was singing
His "Quack! quack! quack!"

The Tailor he heard him,
And waxed very wroth—
He threw down his shears,
And he rolled up his cloth.
"Oh, wife, go and fetch me
My dogs and my gun;
I'll soon make a dead duck
Of this yer one!"

Then bravely he charged,
And fired off his gun,
The blunderbuss it kicked,
The dogs were scared and run;
The tailor it was
That lay on his back,
The duck flew away
Singing "Quack! quack! quack!"

Cries the tailor, "Odd-zooks!
I'll soon spoil their fun;
I'll send down South
For new dogs and gun!
By my good goose and shears!
I'll scatter the pack
That call a good tailor
A quack, quack, quack."

### *PARALLELS.*

WE find the following on the recently executed murderer, Edward W. Green, in the *Right Way:*

Although it is now probably too late to save the life of this unfortunate man, yet the error soon to be committed by his execution cannot be too plainly pointed out. It is not for the purpose of encouraging any fallacious hope in his case, nor yet with any wish or purpose to treat lightly the solemnity of the occasion, that I call attention to the palpable reasons why the sentence of death should not be inflicted upon Mr. Green; but it is solely with a view to the inculcation of just principles, and the vindication of the Constitution.

In approaching a settlement of this case, two methods or plans only were open. Mr. Green had put himself (for reasons more or less justifiable in his own mind) against the authority of the State. He had been conquered. How then should he be treated? Either the State must subjugate him, restrain him of his liberty for a period, and finally, if it pleased to do so, hang him; or else it must consider him an equal with all other citizens, and entitled to all the respect, consideration, rights, and liberties common to the whole.

One party urged that the former course ought to be pursued,—some demanding punishment, others irreversible guarantees. It was alleged, that, if permitted to reassume the position, so long held in abeyance, of an honored and equal citizen, without any conditions being imposed upon him, he might again repudiate his allegiance to society, and again take up arms in defence of his local sovereignty. This charge is a gratuitous insult to a brave and chivalrous man, who proved his gallantry by the very act for which he is condemned, and can only tend to still further alienate his feelings.

How much wiser to exercise forbearance! Mr. Green should be *conciliated*, should be *trusted. He accepts the situation.* He acknowledges himself defeated. He has revived his regard for the sacredness of human life. *He is willing to come back.* He should be permitted to do so. The fatted calf should be killed, and the citizens of Malden should welcome him with open arms as a prodigal son returned, an erring child forgiven, a wayward brother restored.

He is *thoroughly reconstructed.* He should be immediately pardoned. Administer to him the *oath of allegiance.* Return him to his post office; or, better still, make him *provisional* chairman of the Board of Selectmen, and show by acts of generous confidence, that his fellow-citizens can afford, and are ready, to be magnanimous. This is the policy of humanity, the *only policy of harmony.*

Is it expected that Mr. Green should *thank the officer* who committed him to prison? That he should *willingly accept a sentence* imposed upon him without consultation with him,—he being the party in interest? That, if brought upon the scaffold, he should *throw his arms around the executioner's neck,* and thank him as his benefactor? "Human Nature does not run in this way."

Besides if we begin by hanging Green, where are we going to stop? We might hang anybody who kills a man. There is no end to the calamities which this sanguinary course would inflict upon society. And, if those who wish to kill people are prevented from doing so, *is not a war of races inevitable?*

But graver than any of these considerations is the manifest *unconstitutionality* of the sentence imposed. The Constitution of the United States provides, that, "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Is *killing a Yankee* regarded as a crime in any of the *eleven* Constitutional States of this Union? And if killing a Yankee be not a crime in Carolina or Mississippi, how can it constitutionally be made a crime in Massachusetts? Are the immunities of the Constitution not respected in this Commonwealth? Next to *killing negroes,*—the grandest known test of *superiority of race* and *devotion to the Constitution,*—*killing Yankees* is most commendable in any of the eleven specified States. Such patriotism is there rewarded with honors and dignities. Shall it be punished and made odious elsewhere? Shall Massachusetts be thus permitted to nullify the Constitution and oppose the execution? I protest against it. EQUAL RIGHTS.

WELL STATED.—The Detroit *Post*, the new paper of Gen. Carl Schurz, has a happy way of "putting things" as the following shows:

If you want to have loyal States, you must not exclude the loyal element from the exercise of political power; or, in other words, you must permit every loyal man, black as well as white, to vote.

If you want to secure the freedman in his freedom, you must give him the political power wherewith to protect himself.

If you want to promote the development of Free Labor in the South, you must enable every man to enforce his rights as a free laborer by political action, as all other rights are protected and enforced.

If you want to place the National Debt above all danger, you must not permit those who owe to that National Debt their freedom and all they cherish in their new condition, to be excluded from the right of suffrage, while those who owe to the National Debt nothing but their defeat are armed with the ballot.

If you want to encourage loyalty and confidence in the justice of the government, you must not sell out your friends for the purpose of pleasing your enemies.

If you want to introduce harmony in the political fabric of the Union, you must make this a nation of citizens equal before the law, and not tolerate the existence of a numerous class with no political rights, and depending for their civil rights upon class legislation.

If you want to prevent the recurrence of sectional strife, you must do away with sectional divergencies by placing the political organism of all the States, South as well as North, upon the same basis of true democratic principle.

A GOOD IDEA.—The boys of the Grammar Schools in New Bedford have formed an association for checking profanity and vulgarity in the schools, and out of respect for James Arnold, have named it "The Arnold Grammar School Association for the Suppression of Profanity and Vulgarity."

A COLORED man received 306 votes for Mayor of Madison, Wis.

## Important Change.

ON and after the first of May, the office of the ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD will be at 39 Nassau st. and 58 Liberty st., at the corner of those streets; one entrance being opposite the Post Office, the other opposite the office of the *Evening Post*, and up three flights of stairs. The rooms are airy and pleasant; and though a little farther down town than Beekman st. the locality is still central, and every way desirable.

### *THE ELEVENTH*
### NATIONAL WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION.

THE Eleventh National Woman's Rights Convention will be held in the City of New York, at the Church of the Puritans, Union Square, on Thursday, the 10th of May, at 10 o'clock.

Addresses will be delivered by ERNESTINE L. ROSE, FRANCES D. GAGE, WENDELL PHILLIPS, THEODORE TILTON, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, and (probably) LUCRETIA MOTT and ANNA E. DICKINSON.

Those who tell us the republican idea is a failure, do not see the deep gulf between our broad theory and partial legislation; do not see that our Government for the last century has been but the repetition of the old experiments of class and caste. Hence, the failure is not in the principle but in the lack of virtue on our part to apply it.

The question now is, have we the wisdom and conscience, from the present upheavings of our political system, to reconstruct a government on the one enduring basis that has never yet been tried—EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL."

From the proposed class legislation in Congress, it is evident we have not yet learned wisdom from the experience of the past; for while our representatives at Washington are discussing the right of suffrage for the black man, as the only protection to life, liberty and happiness, they deny that "necessity of citizenship" to woman, by proposing to introduce the word "male" into the Federal Constitution. In securing suffrage but to another shade of manhood, while we disfranchise fifteen million tax-payers, we come not one line nearer the republican idea. Can a ballot in the hand of woman, and dignity on her brow, more unsex her than do a sceptre and a crown? Shall an American Congress pay less honor to the daughter of a President than a British Parliament to the daughter of a King? Should not our petitions command as respectful a hearing in a republican Senate, as a speech of Victoria in the House of Lords? Do we not claim that here all men and women are nobles,—all heirs apparent to the throne? The fact that this backward legislation has roused so little thought or protest from the women of the country, but proves what some of our ablest thinkers have already declared, that the greatest barrier to a government of equality, is found in the aristocracy of its women. For while woman holds an ideal position above man in the work of life, poorly imitating the pomp, heraldry and distinctions of an effete European civilization, we as a nation can never realize the divine idea of equality that man in his highest moments has enunciated to the world.

To build a true republic, the church and the home must undergo the same upheaving we now see in the State;—for while our egotism, selfishness, luxury and ease are baptized in the name of him whose life was sacrifice,—while at the family altar we are taught to worship wealth, power and position, rather than humanity, it is vain to talk of a republican government:—The fair fruits of liberty, equality and fraternity must be blighted in the bud, till cherished in the heart of woman.

At this hour the nation needs the highest thought and inspiration of a true womanhood infused into every vein and artery of its life;—and woman needs a broader, deeper education, such as a pure religion and lofty patriotism alone can give. From the baptism of this second revolution, should not woman come forth with new strength and dignity, clothed in all those "rights, privileges and immunities" that shall best enable her to fulfil her highest duties to Humanity, her Country, her Family and Herself?

In behalf of the National Woman's Rights Central Committee,

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, Pres.
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Sec.

New York (48 Beekman st.,) March 31, 1866.

### *SUFFRAGE A FUNCTION.*

A WRITER in the Boston *Right Way* analyzes and defines suffrage as follows. As W. G. S. is a Maryland man, it will be gratifying to our Woman's Rights apostles to know that their cause is penetrating even the South:

"Suffrage," says Gov. Swann, of Maryland, "is a function of the State." What is a *function*, and what is a *State*, and what is *suffrage?*

A *State* is a community erected into a government. No government is a rightful one, unless it is the expression of all the members of the community. Hence, Democracy is the only rightful form of government among men.

A *function* is something that can be done. It is a derivative power to do a thing. We speak of the function of an office. It is not the function of a government or State to grant a right that is inherent in the members of the community, who by their united voices set up the State.

*Suffrage* is the asking, of one or more members of a community by the other members thereof, to carry on their government or State for them. It is an inherent, natural right in every member of the State. If a State be formed and carried on by any number of men less than the whole body of the community. it is not a Democracy. It is the usurpation of the natural right of the excluded to govern, or share in the government.

If ninety-nine men out of a hundred have a right to form a government without the consent of the one who is excluded, then one man has an equal right to make and administer a government for ninety-nine, without their consent. This is the basis of all autocratic, monarchical, oligarchical and aristocratic governments. If it is a function of the State composed of ninety-nine men out of one hundred to withhold from or grant to the remaining one the right of suffrage, then it is a function of the autocrat, or monarch, or oligarchy, or aristocracy, to withhold from or grant to all others the right.

The right of suffrage belongs to and inheres in every man in a community. All just government rests on the consent of the governed; and every man in a community is necessarily a subject of the government, and, therefore, ought to have a voice in the formation and administration. Suffrage is a natural right. It cannot be *conferred*, though it may be taken away as a *punishment for crime*, in the judgment of all the rest of the community. God gives the right of suffrage. It is of course a right that is inherent in the sane and sound mind.

Mr. Boutwell confines it to the male head of the family, because he is its natural defender. We go farther. We believe it is the natural right of every woman, too; for it is as much her duty to defend the family as it is her husband's. Every Democracy which excludes her from the ballot-box is only half a government of the people. But, waiving this question, we think we have shown conclusively the error of Gov. Swann's assumption, that suffrage is a function of the State. It is the natural and inalienable right of every man and woman in a community or State. W. G. S.

### *OBITUARY.*

DIED, in Philadelphia, Pa., on the 3d of Fourth month, 1866, JOSIAH BOND, in the 61st year of his age. Interred at Longwood.

The deceased was among the early and devoted friends of the slave and of the free colored people. He possessed great nervous activity, and but few men espoused the cause of the proscribed and down-trodden with more zeal and enthusiasm than he did. Much of his leisure time, from his simple occupation as a retail produce dealer, has been spent mingling with the colored people in their churches, conferences, and other gatherings, in city and country; exhorting them to the cultivation and practice of all the moral virtues, inciting them to industry, economy, cleanliness, education and self-respect. He lived to witness the reward of his sacrifices and labors in the great improvement among them in these respects, and often spoke of it with much satisfaction.

He was a member of the Society of Friends, but was no sectarian. His disregard of form and ceremony, his indifference to public sentiment, his ultra views and teachings, and sometimes peculiar manner of presenting his thoughts, rendered him unpopular and excited prejudices against him with many. Those who knew him best and could appreciate his impulses and motives most correctly, can best estimate his services in the cause of mental and religious liberty, and universal freedom.

He has gone to his reward. Let that great heart and active brain rest in peace!—*Communicated.*

### *CONGRESS.*

SATURDAY, April 21.—Senate not in session. The House of Representatives held their customary Saturday feast of speech making, the President's Message, by order, being the text. Mr. Nicholson of Del., Mr. Perham of Maine and Mr. Thomas of Maryland led the way, when Mr. Smith of Kentucky got the floor and said: The secession ordinances were null and void, and all the acts passed by Congress during the four years of war were passed upon the ground that these rebel States were not out of the Union, and could not get out of the Union. It did not follow because the rebel States were admitted to the right of representation in Congress, disloyal Representatives should be allowed to take seats in either House. That had never been asked by the President or any other loyal man.

Mr. Schofield (Pa.) asked if it was any difference whether a man who had been engaged in the rebellion was admitted as a Representative, or a man who had not been engaged in the rebellion, but who would vote exactly as the ex-rebel would vote.

Mr. Smith replied that he did not see how that difficulty could be avoided. There was nothing in the Constitution or laws by which it could be done. It did not follow that his own district, or the district of his very Radical friend (McKee) would hereafter send a Representative of their stamp. Because the State of Illinois sent to this House a man who was seven feet eleven inches high, did it follow that the same district would hereafter send a man of the same stature, or of the same strong political views? (Laughter.) What legislation could regulate this thing?

Mr. Boutwell (Mass.) asked whether the gentleman did not see a difference between canvassing the political opinions of men elected from the loyal States on questions concerning the administration of the government and recognizing the right of a people who are at present not represented, to be represented until some affirmative action is taken on the part of the government.

Mr. Smith admitted the difference in the two propositions, but he did not see why States in which the conditions did not exist, should not be admitted to representation.

Mr. Boutwell asked whether the gentleman from Kentucky would confine the elective franchise in Mississippi, for example, to loyal white men, excluding disloyal white men.

Mr. Smith replied that he would.

Mr. Boutwell then asked whether the gentleman expected that the nine-tenths of disloyal people would permit the other tenth to set up and continue a government from which they would be excluded.

Mr. Smith replied that it was for Congress to solve that problem. Why did not Congress fix it, and let the loyal tenth be represented in Congress?

Mr. Randall (Pa.) asked Mr. Boutwell whether the rights of the loyal one-tenth of a State were to be impaired by the disloyal nine-tenths, and whether the loyal tenth, being taxed, was not entitled to representation.

Mr. Boutwell replied that there was no right in the one-tenth of the people of a State, even though loyal, to be represented in Congress. It was the right of the people of the whole State, when they demonstrated as a whole their loyalty to the government to be represented as the people of a State.

Mr. Randall remarked that that doctrine overturned the doctrines of Mr. Lincoln from beginning to end.

Mr. Smith having resumed the floor, drifted to the conflict between the President and Congress. He asked why, if the President had no power to do what he had done, Congress had not undone it, and done something that would be better?

Drifting into the question of the trial of Jefferson Davis, Mr. Smith said the President had relieved from pardon five hundred of the leading spirits of the Rebellion, and he asked why Congress had not, by bill or resolution, called for their trial and execution. It was because Congress wanted to dodge the question.

Mr. Schofield asked why Mr. Smith had not introduced such a measure.

Mr. Smith said he would do so if those who were so fond of blood did not.

Mr. Randall (Pa.) suggested that the President had, on the 2d of October, 1865, addressed a letter to Chief-Justice Chase on the subjec, and that the Chief-Justice, on the 12th of the same month, replied, declining to hold such court as had been suggested by the President, and suggesting a trial by military commission.

Mr. Smith knew that it was so, for he had read it in the *Tribune.*

Mr. Shellabarger (O.) desired to make a statement in that connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief-Justice was proper, as the condition of the country was such as to make a judicial trial under the circumstances naught else than a mockery. He solemnly averred his belief that if the President and Congress had the Constitutional right to employ the means to which we alluded for the restoration of the States, and if they would in good faith unite to apply and put in force the principle which both professed to hold, the work of restoration would be, if not easy, at least ultimately certain, and at once secured. That principle was, that in all those States truly loyal people should alone have power of government, either by the holding or the exercise of the elective franchise, and that "the conscious and responsible leaders of the rebellion" should be tried, convicted, and executed. The avowals by the President of his desire for the exclusion of rebels from all powers of government, and for their condign punishment, had been so frequent, so recent, and explicit, that to doubt their sincerity would be to attribute to the President treachery to his professions, and infidelity to all instances of honor and manhood. It would be to attribute to him purposes and conduct which would be disgraceful in the most vulgar political harlequin, but which, in the ruler of a great and generous people who had so honored and trusted him, would be utterly disgusting and infamous. Congress had already indicated its belief in the same thing. It was obvious, therefore, that the President and Congress agreed that the disloyal should be sternly excluded by severe ordeals from government until they bring forth fruits meet for repentance. He then proceeded to discuss the right of Congress to exclude from citizenship all who had voluntarily renounced it, sustaining his position on the Constitution, on international law, and on precedents established and practiced by foreign government, and followed by the American government in the case of persons who had been engaged in Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts.

Mr. Hale (Rep., N. Y.) inquired whether, in the precedents cited from the course of foreign governments, the persons whose rights were forfeited had not been first tried and found guilty by a court of competent jurisdiction?

Mr. Shellabarger replied that the forfeiture took effect by the act of the sovereign, or the law-making power, without the interposition of judicial power.

Mr. Hale inquired whether, in the case of Shay's rebellion, forfeiture of civil rights did not apply exclusively to those who had been tried and convicted?

Mr. Shellabarger replied in the negative.

Mr. Hale wanted to know, then, how the fact that persons had been engaged in the rebellion had been ascertained?

Mr. Shellabarger's answer failed to throw much light on that point, but he continued his argument.

Mr. Hale interrupted him to ask another question. The drift of the gentleman's argument, he said, was to show that Congress might lawfully enact forfeiture of citizenship as a penalty for having been engaged in rebellion against the government. He submitted whether there was not another difficulty in the case, namely, that by an express provision of the Constitution, which the gentleman had failed to notice, the imposition of penalty for any crime whatever committed before the passage of the act, is expressly and directly within the definition of an *ex post facto* law, and whether it was not thereby forbidden by the Constitution just as effectually as bills of attainder were forbidden. If Congress might by legislation enact the forfeiture of citizenship for rebellion or disloyalty, might it not, by the same rule, enact any other different penalty for an offence committed before the passage of the act?

Mr. Shellabarger replied that that provision of the Constitution had no application to the matter he was discussing. Mal-provision related to the punishment of crime. What he was considering was an exercise of national sovereignty, not in punishment of crime, but simply depriving men, who, by acts of disloyalty, had voluntarily renounced their allegiance to their own government, of the right to resume their political powers. He would not have what he said pushed to any other consequence than the consequence to which he pushed his argument, namely, that the right of citizenship being of national donation, of national definition, and of national control, was a matter, the deprivation of which, as a consequence of a voluntary surrender of the obligations of citizenship, was not like an infliction of punishment for crime, but was simply a declaration of the sovereign that, as they had surrendered their political franchises, they should not continue to exercise them. He sustained his position also by reference to a provision in the Army Appropriation bill of 1864, declaring that deserters from the army forfeited all the rights of citizenship, and were forever incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the United States, or of exercising any right of citizenship; and he asked whether desertion was a higher offence than three or four years of war against the national existence. The passage of such a law as he suggested would stand as a practical assertion of the exercise and application of the national powers of self-preservation for which he contended.

Mr. Shellabarger spoke for an hour and a half.

SENATE.—The question of admitting Colorado to the Union was further considered on Tuesday, as per appointment, but with only the following result:

The bill for the admission of Colorado was taken up as the special order. The pending question was a motion to reconsider.

Mr. Sumner spoke against the proposition, reiterating his arguments (heretofore published) of the inadequacy of the population of Colorado, and in regard to the insertion of the word "white" in her newly-adopted State Constitution. The population of Colorado, he claimed, had decreased with every year since 1861. In 1861 the aggregate vote of the Territory was 10,580, and in December of the same year, 9,354. In September, 1864, the aggregate vote was 6,192, and in last September, only 5,905. Referring to a pamphlet on the resources of Colorado, published by Messrs. Evans and Chaffer, the Senators-elect from Colorado, he quoted from the Report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War on the massacre of the Cheyenne Indians, before which Mr. Evans, the Governor of Colorado, was summoned. The Report states that the testimony of Mr. Evans was of a prevaricating and shuffling character. The same prevaricating and shuffling, Mr. Sumner said, were apparent in the pamphlet of Mr. Evans. There was a retrogression in every aspect in regard to that Territory, but the greatest of all was its retrogression in republican government. The original organic act of this Territory allowed every male person of the age of twenty-one years and upwards to exercise the elective franchise, but in 1864 the Legislative Assembly declared that no person being a negro or mulatto should be a voter.

Mr. Trumbull interrupted Mr. Sumner to say that it was not true that colored persons had ever voted in Colorado. The right of suffrage had been confined to citizens of the United States, according to statute law, and colored men were not believed to be citizens.

THE HABEAS CORPUS.

A message was here received from the House announcing nonconcurrence in the Senate amendments to the bill in relation to the habeas corpus.

Mr. Sumner, of Mass., resumed his remarks on the Colorado bill, saying, in conclusion: "Against all this I hear a whisper, not an argument. It is whispered that we need two more votes on this floor. Sir, there is something that we need more than two more votes; it is loyalty to that great principle which is now in question. Better far than any number of votes will be loyalty to that great cause. Tell me not, sir, that it is inexpedient to create two more votes in this chamber. Permit me to say, sir, nothing can be expedient that is not right; and if I were now about to pronounce the last words I could ever utter in this chamber, I would say to you: Senators, do not forget that right is always the highest expediency.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The Chair laid before the Senate a message from the President, in response to a resolution of the Senate transmitting the record of the commission assembled in St. Louis in relation to brevet appointments in the regular army.

COLORADO CONTINUED.

Mr. Stewart, of Nevada, spoke briefly in favor of the admission of Colorado.

Mr. Guthrie, of Kentucky, referred to the small population of Colorado as a reason against its admission. He had no doubt she had less population now than when the Enabling act was passed. There was at one time a great rush of gold miners to the Territory; but most of them had since left, finding no gold there. He believed a Territorial government better suited than a State government for the people who lived in Colorado. He thought the Senate ought to increase its votes legitimately by admitting the twenty-two Senators from the Southern States; that would be better than to increase, as the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) had suggested, by admitting Colorado. It was far more to the advantage of the country that the Senate should admit the Southern States than that it should admit Colorado. The Senator from Massachusetts had spoken about increasing the vote of the Senate. He ought to have thought of this while making his onslaught upon the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. Nye (Rep.), of Nevada, replied to the arguments of Mr. Sumner. He alluded to the population and resources of the Territory, alleging that it contained twice as much tillable land as Massachusetts. She paid $132,625 revenue tax last year, exclusive of the stamp tax, against $56,000 in Nebraska, $49,000 in New Mexico, and $21,000 in Utah. He would not vote against the State because of the word "white," because he believed that it was only a phantom that would not last; that before twelve months rolled around, colored men would vote in Nevada and in Colorado. The b

# Miscellaneous Department.

FOR THE STANDARD.

## MY DREAM BESIDE THE SEA.

"Forever and Forever,"—there came a Voice to me,—
"Forever and Forever,—Measure now and tell it me,
The sands upon the sea-shore, the drops within the sea;
For the Wrong shall yet be righted,
And the poor and the affrighted,
The down-trodden and the slighted,
Are precious unto me;
And I have my Forever:
Wait, doubting soul! and see."

"Forever and Forever;—alas, oh Lord!" I cried,
"I cannot count the sea-sands, I cannot weigh the tide:
I only see the Oppressor growing strong on every side.
I wait a coming sorrrow,
And my heart is fain to borrow
Only terror for the morrow;
And what is it to me,
The sands upon the sea-shore,
The drops within the sea?"

"Forever and Forever,—oh, impotent," he said,
"To know the lesser knowledge! And shall I take the bread,
The children's bread, and give it unto the dogs instead?"
"Nay, Lord," I cried, undaunted,—
"But even the dogs are granted
The crumbs that are not wanted;
So let them down to me,—
Dear Lord, from Thy full table,
Let down the crumbs to me!"

"Forever and Forever!" no other answer came:
A sudden tremor seized me; I woke for very shame;
I woke, and bowed and worshipped, and spoke His sacred Name,
Who reigneth King Eternal,
Beneath whose sway supernal,
Shall fail all Powers infernal,—
And FAITH came back to me!
And I think my dream had meaning,
My dream beside the sea.

CAROLINE A. MASON.

## MR. CARLYLE'S ADDRESS

TO THE

## EDINBURGH STUDENTS.

MR. CARLYLE on rising to address the students, having thrown off his robe, came to the table amid loud cheers. When the applause had subsided, he said. Gentlemen: I have accepted the office you have elected me to, and have now the duty to return thanks for the great honor done me. Your enthusiasm toward me, I admit, is very beautiful in itself, however undeserved it may be in regard to the object of it. It is a feeling honorable to all men, and one well known to myself, when I was in a position analogous to your own. I can only hope that it will endure to the end—that noble desire to honor those whom you think worthy of honor; and that you will come to be more and more select and discriminate in the choice of the object of it, for I can well understand that you will modify your opinions of me and many things else as you go on. (Laughter and cheers.) There are now 56 years gone last November since I first entered your city, a boy of not quite 14—56 years ago—to attend classes here, and gain knowledge of all kinds, I know not what—with feelings of wonder and awe-struck expectation; and now, after a long, long course, this is what we have come to. (Cheers.) There is something touching and tragic, and yet at the same time beautiful, to see the third generation, as it were, of my dear old native land, rising up and saying, "Well, you are not altogether an unworthy laborer in the vineyard; you have toiled through a great variety of fortunes, and have had many judges." As the old proverb says, "He that builds by the wayside has many masters." We must except a variety of judges; but the voice of young Scotland, through you, is really of some value to me, and I return you many thanks for it, though I cannot describe my emotions to you, and, perhaps, they will be much more conceivable if expressed in silence. (Cheers.) When this office was proposed to me, some of you know that I was not very ambitious to accept it at first. I was taught to believe that there were certain more or less important duties which would lie in my power. This, I confess, was my chief motive in going into it—at least, in reconciling the objections I felt to such things; for if I can do anything to honor you and my dear old *Alma Mater*, why should I not do so? (Loud cheers.) Well, but on practically looking at the matter when the office actually came into my hands, I find it grows more and more uncertain and abstruse to me whether there is much real duty that I can do at all. I live 400 miles away from you, in an entirely different state of things; and my weak health—now for many years accumulating upon me—and total unacquaintance with such subjects as concern your affairs here—all this fills me with apprehension that there is really nothing worth the least consideration that I can do on that score. You may, however, depend upon it that if any such duty does arise in any form, I will use my most faithful endeavor to do whatever is right and proper, according to the best of my judgment. (Cheers.) In the meanwhile, the duty I have at present—which might be very pleasant, but which is quite the reverse, as you may fancy—is to address some words to you on some subjects more or less cognate to the pursuits you are engaged in. In fact, I had meant to throw out some loose observations—loose in point of order, I mean—in such a way as they occur to me—the thoughts I have in me about the business you are engaged in, the race you have started on, what kind of race it is you young gentlemen have begun, and what sort of arena you are likely to find in this world. I ought, I believe, according to custom, to have written all that down on paper, and had it read out. That would have been much handier for me at the present moment (a laugh); but, when I attempted to write, I found that I was not accustomed to write speeches, and that I did not get on very well. So I flung that away, and resolved to trust to the inspiration of the moment—just to what came uppermost. You will, therefore, have to accept what is readiest—what comes direct from the heart; and you must just take that in compensation for any good order or arrangement there might have been in it. I will endeavor to say nothing that is not true as far as I can manage, and that is pretty much all I can engage for. (A laugh.) Advices, I believe, to young men—as to all men—are very seldom much valued. There is a great deal of advising, and very little faithful performing—and talk that does not end in any kind of action is better suppressed altogether. I would not, therefore, go much into advising; but there is one advice I must give you. It is, in fact, the summary of all advices, and you have heard it a thousand times, I dare say; but I must nevertheless let you hear it the thousandth and first time, for it is most intensely true, whether you will believe it at present or not—viz., that above all things the interest of your life depends upon being diligent now while it is called to-day, in this place where you have come to get education. Diligent!—that includes all virtues in it that a student can have: I mean to include in it all qualities that lead on the acquirement of real instruction and improvement in such a place. If you will believe me, you who are young, yours is the golden season of life. As you have heard it called, so it verily is—the seedtime of life, in which, if you do not sow, or if you sow tares instead of wheat, you cannot expect to reap well afterward, and you will arrive at little indeed; while in the course of years when you come to look back, if you have not done what you have heard from your advisers—and among many counsellors there is wisdom—you will bitterly repent when it is too late. The habits of study acquired at universities are of the highest importance in after-life. At the season when you are young in years the whole mind is, as it were, fluid, and is capable of forming itself into any shape that the owner of the mind pleases to let it order it to form itself into. The mind is in a fluid state, but it hardens up gradually to the consistency of rock or iron, and you cannot alter the habits of an old man; for as he has begun he will proceed and go on to the last. By diligence I mean among other things—and very chiefly—I mean honesty in all your inquiries into what you are about. Pursue your studies in the way your conscience calls honest. More and more endeavor to do that. Keep, I mean to say, an accurate separation between what you have really come to know in your own minds and what is still unknown. Leave all that on the hypothetical side of the barrier, as things afterward to be acquired if acquired at all; and be careful not to stamp a thing as known when you do not yet know it. Count a thing known only when it is stamped on your mind, so that you may survey it on all sides with intelligence. There is such a thing as a man endeavoring to persuade himself, and endeavoring to persuade others, that he knows about things, when he does not know more than the outside skin of them; and yet he goes flourishing about with them. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) There is also a process called cramming in some universities—(a laugh)—that is, getting up such points of things as the examiner is likely to put questions about. Avoid all that as entirely unworthy of an honorable mind. Be modest, and humble, and diligent in your attention to what your teachers tell you, who are profoundly interested in trying to bring you forward in the right way, so far as they have been able to understand it. Try all things they set before you, in order, if possible, to understand them, and to follow them in proportion to your fitness for them. Gradually see what kind of work you can do; for it is the first of all problems for a man to find out what kind of work he is to do in this universe. In fact, morality as regards study is, as in all other things, the primary consideration, and overrides all others. A dishonest man cannot do anything real; and it would be greatly better if he were tied up from doing any such thing. He does nothing but darken counsel by the words he utters. That is a very old doctrine—but a very true one; and you will find it confirmed by all the thinking men that have ever lived in this long series of generations of which we are the latest. I dare say you know, very many of you, that it is now 700 years since universities were first set up in this world of ours. Abelard and other people had risen up with doctrines in them the people wished to hear of, and students flocked toward them from all parts of the world. There was no getting the thing recorded in books, as you may know. You had to hear the man speaking to you vocally, or else you could not learn at all what it was that he wanted to say. And so they gathered together—the various people who had anything to teach—and formed themselves gradually under the patronage of kings and other potentates who were anxious about the culture of their populations—nobly anxious for their benefit, and became a university. I dare say you have heard it said, that all that is greatly altered by the invention of printing, which took place about midway between us and the origin of universities. A man has not now to go away where a professor is actually speaking, because in most cases he can get his doctrine out of him through a book, and can read it, and read it again and again, and study it. I don't know that I know of any way in which the whole facts of a subject may be more completely taken in, if our studies are molded in conformity with it. Nevertheless, universities have, and will continue to have, an indispensable value in society—a very high value. I consider the very highest interest of man vitally entrusted to them. In regard to theology, as you are aware, it has been the study of the deepest heads that have come into the world—what is the nature of this stupendous universe, and what its relations to all things, as known to man, and as only known to the awful Author of it? In fact, the members of the church keeping theology in a lively condition (laughter) for the benefit of the whole population, was the great object of the universities. I consider it is the same now intrinsically, though very much forgotten, from many causes, and not so successful as might be wished at all. (A laugh.) It remains, however, a very curious truth, which has been said by observant people, that the main use of the universities in the present age is that, after you have done with all your classes, the next thing is a collection of books, a great library of good books, which you proceed to study and to read. What the universities have mainly done—what I have found the university did for me was that it taught me to read in various languages and various sciences, so that I could go into the books that treated of these things, and pry into anything I wanted to make myself master of gradually, as I found it suit me. Whatever you may think of all that, the clearest and most imperative duty lies on every one of you to be assiduous in your reading. Learn to be good readers—which is, perhaps, a more difficult thing than you imagine. Learn to be discriminative in your reading—to read all kinds of things that you have an interest in, and that you find to be really fit for what you are engaged in. Of course, at the present time, in a great deal of the reading incumbent on you, you must be guided by the books recommended to you by your professors for assistance toward the effect of their predilections. And then, when you get out of the university, and go into studies of your own, you will find it very important that you have selected a field in which you can study and work. The most unhappy of all men is the man who cannot tell what he is going to do, that has got no work cut out for him in the world, and does not go into it. For work is the grand cure of all the maladies and miseries that ever beset mankind—honest work, which you intend getting done. If you are in a strait, a very good indication as to choice—perhaps the best you can get—is a book you have a great curiosity about. You are then in the readiest and best of all possible conditions to improve by that book. It is analagous to what doctors tell us about the physical health and appetites of the patient. You must learn to distinguish between false appetite and real. There is such a thing as a false appetite, which will lead a man into vagaries with regard to diet, will tempt him to eat spicy things which he should not eat at all, and would not but that they are toothsome, and from a momentary baseness of mind. A man ought to inquire and find out what he really and truly has an appetite for—what suits his constitution; and that, doctors tell him, is the very thing he ought to have, in general. And so with books. As applicable to almost all of you, I will say that it is highly expedient to go into history—to inquire into what has passed before you in the family of man. The history of the Romans and Greeks will first of all concern you; and you will find that the classical knowledge you have got will be extremely applicable to elucidate that. There you have the most remarkable races of men in the world set before you, to say nothing of the languages, which your professors can better explain, and which, I believe, are admitted to be the most perfect orders of speech we have yet found to exist among men. And you will find, if you read well, a pair of extremely remarkable nations shining, in the records left by themselves, as a kind of pillar to light up life in the darkness of the past ages; and it will be well worth your while if you can get into the understanding of what these people were, and what they did. You will find a great deal of hearsay, as I have found, that does not touch on the matter; but perhaps some of you will get to see Roman and Greek face to face; you will know in some measure how they contrived to exist, and to perform their feats in the world. I believe, also, you will find a thing not much noted, that there was a very great deal of deep religion in both nations. That is noted by the wisest of historians, and particularly by Ferguson, who is particularly well worth reading on Roman history, and who, I believe, was an alumnus of our own university. His book is a very creditable book. He points out the profoundly religious nature of the Roman people, notwithstanding the wildness and ferociousness of their nature. They believed that Jupiter Optimus Maximus was the lord of the universe, and that he had appointed the Romans to become the chief of men, provided they followed his commands—to brave all difficulty, and to stand up with an invincible front—to be ready to do and die; and also to have the same sacred regard to veracity, to promise, to integrity, and all the virtues that surround that noblest quality of man—courage—to which the Romans gave the name of virtue, manhood, as the one thing ennobling for a man. In the literary ages of Rome, that had very much decayed away; but still it had retained its place among the lower classes of the Roman people. Of the deeply religious nature of the Greeks, along with their beautiful and sunny effulgencies of art, you have striking proof, if you look for it. In the tragedies of Sophocles, there is a most distinct recognition of the eternal justice of Heaven, and the untailing punishment of crime against the laws of God. I believe you will find in all histories that that has been at the head and foundation of them all; and that no nation that did not contemplate this wonderful universe with an awestricken and reverential feeling that there was a great unknown, omnipotent, and all-wise, and all-virtuous Being, superintending all men in it, and all interests in it—no nation ever came to very much, nor did any man either, who forgot that. If a man did forget that, he forgot the most important part of his mission in this world. Our own history of England, which you will take a great deal of natural pains to make yourselves acquainted with, you will find beyond all others worthy of your study; because I believe that the British nation—and I include in that the Scottish nation—produced a finer set of men than any you will find it possible to get anywhere else in the world. (Applause.) I don't know in any history of Greece or Rome where you will get so fine a man as Oliver Cromwell. (Applause.) And we have had men worthy of memory in our little corner of the island here as well as others, and our history has been strong at least in being connected with the world-history—for if you examine well you will find that John Knox was the author, as it were, of Oliver Cromwell; that the Puritan revolution would never have taken place in England at all had it not been for that Scotchman. (Applause). That is an authentic fact, and is not prompted by national vanity on my part at all. (Laughter and applause). And it is very possible, if you look at the struggle that was then going on in England, as I have had to do in my time, you will see that people were overawed by the immense impediments lying in the way. A small minority of God-fearing men in the country were flying away with any ship they could get to New England, rather than take the lion by the beard. They dare not confront the powers with their most just complaints, to be delivered from idolatry. They wanted to make the nation altogether conformable to the Hebrew Bible, which they understood to be according to the will of God; and there could be no aim more legitimate. However, they could not have got their desire fulfilled at all if Knox had not succeeded by the firmness and nobleness of his mind. For he is also of the select of the earth to me—John Knox. (Applause.) What he has suffered from the ungrateful generations that have followed him should really make us humble ourselves to the dust, to think that the most excellent man our country has produced, to whom we owe everything that distinguishes us among modern nations, should have been so sneered at and abused. (Applause.) Knox was heard by Scotland—the people heard him with the marrow of their bones—they took up his doctrine, and they defied principalities and powers to move them from it. "We must have it," they said. It was in that time the Puritan struggle arose in England, and you know well that the Scottish earls and nobility, with their tenantry, marched away to Dunse Hill, and sat down there; and just in the course of that struggle, when it was either to be suppressed or brought into greater vitality, they encamped on the top of Dunse Hill 30,000 armed men, drilled for that occasion, each regiment around its landlord, its earl, or whatever he might be called, and eager for Christ's crown and covenant. That was the signal for all England rising up into unappeasable determination to have the Gospel there also; and you know it went on and came to be a contest whether the parliament or the King should rule—whether it should be old formalities, and use, and wont, or something that had been of new conceived in the souls of men, namely, a divine determination to walk according to the laws of God here as the sum of all prosperity—which of these should have the mastery; and after a long, long agony of struggle it was decided—the way we know. I should say also of that Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell's—notwithstanding the abuse it has encountered, and the denial of everybody that it was able to get on in the world, and so on—it appears to me to have been the most salutary thing in the modern history of England, on the whole. If Oliver Cromwell had continued it out I don't know what it would have come to. It would have got corrupted, perhaps, in other hands, and could not have gone on; but it was pure and true to the last fiber in his mind; there was truth in it when he ruled over it. Machiavelli has remarked, in speaking about the Romans, that democracy cannot exist anywhere in the world; that as a government it is an impossibility that it should be continued; and he goes on proving that in his own way. I do not ask you all to follow him in this conviction—(hear)—but it is to him a clear truth that it is a solecism and impossibility that the universal mass of men should govern themselves. He says of the Romans that they continued a long time, but it was purely in virtue of this item in their constitution—namely, that they had all the conviction in their minds that it was solemnly necessary at times to appoint a dictator—a man who had the power of life and death over everything—who degraded men out of their places, ordered them for execution, and did whatever seemed to him good in the name of God above him. He was commanded to take care that the republic suffered no detriment, and Machiavelli calculates that that was the thing that purified the social system from time to time and enabled it to continue as it did—an extremely likely thing, if it was composed of nothing but bad and tumultuous men triumphing in general over the better, and all going the bad road, in fact. Well, Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate, or Dictatorate if you will, lasted for about ten years; and you will find that nothing that was contrary to the laws of heaven was allowed to live by Oliver. (Applause.) For example, it was found by his parliament, called "Barebones"—the most zealous of all parliaments, probably—(laughter)—that the Court of Chancery in England was in a state that was really capable of no apology—no man could get up and say that that was a right court. There were, I think, fifteen thousand, or fifteen hundred—(laughter)—I really don't remember which, but we shall call it by the last—(renewed laughter)—there were fifteen hundred cases lying in it undecided; and one of them, I remember, for a large amount of money, was eighty-three years old, and it was going on still; wigs were waving over it still, and lawyers were taking their fees, and there was no end of it. Upon which the Barebones people, after deliberation about it, though it was expedient and commanded by the Author of Man and the Fountain of Justice, and for the true and right, to abolish the Court. Really, I don't know who could have dissented from that opinion. At the same time, it was thought by those who were wiser, and had more experience of the world, that it was a very dangerous thing, and would never suit all. The lawyers began to make an immense noise about it. (Laughter.) All the public—the great mass of solid and well-disposed people who had got no deep insight into such matters, were very adverse to it, and the President of it—old Sir Francis Rous, who translated the Psalms—those that we sing every Sunday in the church yet—a very good man, and a wise man, and Provost of Eton—he got a great number of the Parliament to go to Oliver the Dictator and lay down their functions altogether and declare officially with their signatures on Monday morning that the Parliament was dissolved. The thing was passed on Saturday night, and on Monday morning Rous came and said, "We cannot carry on the affair any longer, and we remit it into the hands of your highness." Oliver in that way became Protector a second time. I give you this as an instance that Oliver felt that the Parliament that had been dismissed had been perfectly right with regard to Chancery, and that there was no doubt of the propriety of abolishing Chancery, or reforming it in some kind of way. He considered it, and this is what he did. He assembled sixty of the wisest lawyers to be found in England. Happily, there were great men in the law—men who valued the laws as much as anybody else does, I suppose. (A laugh.) Oliver said to them, "Go and examine this thing, and in the name of God inform me what is necessary to be done with regard to it. You will see how we may clean out the foul things in it that render it poison to everybody." Well, they sat down then, and in the course of six weeks—there was no public speaking then, no reporting of speeches, and no babble of kind, there was just the business on hand—they got any sixty propositions fixed in their minds of the things that required to be done. And upon these sixty propositions Chancery was reconstituted and remodelled, and so it has lasted to our time. It had become a nuisance, and could not have continued much longer. That is an instance of the manner in which things were done when a dictatorship prevailed in the country, and that was what the Dictator did. Upon the whole, I do not think that, in general, out of common history books, you will ever get into the real history of this country, or anything particular which it would beseem you to know. You may read very ingenious and very clever books by men whom it would be the height of insolence in me to do any other thing than express my respect for. But their position is essentially skeptical. Man is unhappily in that condition that he will make only a temporary explanation of anything, and you will not be able, if you are like these men, to understand how this island came to be what it is. You will not find it recorded in books. You will find recorded in books a jumble of tumults, disastrous meptitudes, and all that kind of thing. But to get what you want you will have to look into side sources, and inquire in all directions. I remember getting Collins's "Peerage" to read—a very poor peerage as a work of genius, but an excellent book for diligence and fidelity. I was writing on Oliver Cromwell at the time. (Applause.) I could get no biographical dictionary, and I thought the peerage book would help me, at least tell me whether people were old or young, and about all persons concerned in the actions about which I wrote. I got a great deal of help out of poor Collins. He was a diligent and dark London bookseller of about a hundred years ago, who compiled out of all kinds of parchment chests, archives, books that were authentic, and all kinds of things out of which he could get it, the information he wanted. He was a very meritorious man. I not only found the solution of anything I wanted there, but I began gradually to perceive this immense fact, which I really began gradually to perceive this immense fact, which I really advise every one of you who reads history to look out for, if he has not already found it. It was that the Kings of England, all the way from the Norman Conquest down to the time of Charles the First had appointed, so far as they knew, those who deserved to be appointed peers. They were all royal men, with minds full of justice, and valor, and humanity, and all kinds of qualities that are good for men to have who ought to rule over others. Then their genealogy was remarkable—and there is a great deal more in genealogies than is generally believed at present. I never heard tell of any clever man that came out of entirely stupid people. (Laughter.) If you look around the families of your acquaintance, you will see such cases in all directions—I know that it has been the case in mine. I can trace the father, and the son, and the grandson, and the family stamp is quite distinctly legible upon each of them, so that it goes for a great deal—the hereditary principle—in government as in other things; and it must be recognized as soon as there is any fixity in things. You will remark that, if at any time the genealogy of a peerage fails—if the man that actually holds the peerage is a fool in these earnest, striking times—the man gets into mischief and gets into treason; he gets himself extinguished altogether, in fact. (Laughter.) From those documents of old Collins, it seems that a peer conducts himself in a solemn, good, pious, manly kind of way when he takes leave of life, and when he has hospitable habits, and is valiant in his procedure throughout; and that in general a King, with a noble approximation to what was right, had nominated this man, saying, "Come you to me, sir; come out of the common level of the people, where you are liable to be trampled upon; come here and take a district of country, and make it like your image more or less; be king under me, and understand that that is your function." To say this is the most divine thing that a human being can do to other human beings, and no kind of thing whatever has so much of the character of God Almighty's divine government as that thing we see that went all over England, and that is the grand soul of England's history. (Cheers.) It is historically true that down to the time of Charles I. it was not understood that any man was made a peer without having a merit in him to constitute him a proper subject for a peerage. In Charles I.'s time it grew to be known or said that, if a man was by birth a gentleman, and was worth £10,000, and bestowed his gifts up and down among courtiers, he could be made a peer. Under Charles II. it went on with still more rapidity, and has been going on with ever increasing velocity until we see the perfect breakneck pace at which they are going now (a laugh) and now a peerage is a paltry kind of thing to what it was in those old times. I could go into a great many more details about tuings of that sort, but I must turn to another branch of the subject. One remark more about your reading. I do not know whether it has been sufficiently brought home to you that there are two kinds of books. When a man is reading on any kind of subject, in most departments of books—in all books, if you take it in a wise sense—you will find that there is a division of good books and bad books—there is a good kind of a book and a bad kind of a book. I am not to assume that you are all very ill acquainted with this; but I may remind you that it is a very important consideration at present. It casts aside altogether the idea that people have, that, if they are reading any book—that if an ignorant man is reading any book, he is doing rather better than nothing at all. I entirely call that in question. I even venture to deny it. (Laughter and cheers.) It would be much safer and better would he have no concern with books at all. There are a number, an increasing number, of books that are decidedly to him not useful. But he will learn also that a certain number of books were written by a supreme, noble kind of people—not a very great number, but still a number adhere more or less to that side of things. In short, as I have written it down somewhere else, I conceive that books are like men's souls—divided into sheep and goats. (Laughter and applause.) Some of them are calculated to be of very great advantage in teaching—in forwarding the teaching of all generations. Others are going down, down, doing more and more, wilder and wilder mischief. And for the rest, in regard to all your studies here, and whatever you may learn, you are to remember that the object is not particular knowledge—that you are going to get higher in technical perfections, and all that sort of thing. There is a higher aim lies at the rear of all that, especially among those who are intended for literary or speaking pursuits, or the sacred profession. You are ever to bear in mind that there lies behind that the acquisition of what may be called wisdom—namely, sound appreciation and just decision as to all the objects that come round about you, and the habit of behaving with justice and wisdom. In short, great is wisdom—great is the value of wisdom. It cannot be exaggerated; it is the highest achievement of man—"Blessed is he that getteth understanding." And that, I believe, occasionally may be missed very easily; but never more easily than now, I think. If that is a failure, all is a failure. However, I will not touch further upon that matter. In this University, I learn from many sides, there is a great and considerable stir about endowments. But I should have said in regard to book reading, if it be so very important, how very useful would an excellent library be in every university. I hope that will not be neglected by those who have charge of you—and, indeed, I am happy to hear that your library is very much improved since the time I knew it; and I hope it will go on improving more and more. You require money to do that, and you require also judgment in the selectors of the books—pious insight into what is really for the advantage of human souls, the exclusion of all kinds of clap-trap books, which merely excite the astonishment of foolish people (Laughter), and the choice of wise books—as much as possible, good books. As I was saying, there appears to be a great demand for endowments—an assiduous and praiseworthy industry for getting new funds collected for encouraging the ingenious youth of universities, especially in this, the chief university in the country. (Hear, hear.) Well, I entirely participate in everybody's approval of the movement. It is very desirable. It should be responded to, and, one expects, most assuredly will. At least, if it is not, it will be shameful to the country of Scotland, which never was so rich in money as at the present moment, and never stood so much in need of getting noble universities, to counteract many influences that are springing up alongside of money. It should not be backward in coming forward in the way of endowments (A laugh), at least in rivalry to our rude old barbarous ancestors, as we have been pleased to call them. Such munificence as their's is beyond all praise, and to them, I am sorry to say, we are not yet by any manner of means equal, or approaching equality. (Laughter.) There is an overabundance of money, and sometimes I cannot help thinking that probably never has there been at any other time in Scotland the hundredth part of the money that now is, or even the thousandth part; for wherever I go there is that gold-nugeting (A laugh)—that prosperity. Many men are counting their balances by millions. Money was never so abundant, and nothing that is good to be done with it. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) No man knows—or very few men know—what benefit to get out of money. In fact, it too often is secretly a curse. Much better for many never to have had any. But I do not expect that generally to be believed. (Laughter.) Nevertheless, I should think it a beautiful relief to many a man that has an honest purpose struggling in him to bequeath a handsome house of refuge, so to speak, for some meritorious man who may hereafter be born into the world, to enable him a little to get on in his way. To do, in fact, as those old Norman kings whom I have described to you—to raise a man out of the dirt and mud where he is getting trampled, unworthily on his part, into some kind of position where he may acquire the power to do some good in his generation. I hope that as much as possible will be done in that way; that efforts will not be relaxed till the thing is in a satisfactory state. At the same time, in regard to the classical department of things, it is to be desired that it were properly supported—that we could allow people to go and devote more leisure possibly to the cultivation of particular departments. We might have more of this from Scotch universities than we have. I am bound, however, to say that it does not appear as if of late times endowment was the real soul of the matter. The English, for example, are the richest people for endowments on the face of the earth in their universities; and it is a remarkable fact that since the time of Bentley, you cannot name anybody that has gained a great name in scholarship among them, or constituted a point of revolution in the pursuits of men in that way. The man that does that is a man worthy of being remembered among men, although he may be a poor man and not endowed with worldly wealth. One man that actually did constitute a revolution was the son of a poor weaver in Saxony, who edited his Tibullus in Dresden in the room of a poor comrade, and who, while he was editing his Tibullus, had to gather his pease-cod shells on the streets and boil them for his dinner. That was his endowment. (Laughter.) But he was recognized soon to have done a great thing. His name was Heine. (Cheers.) I can remember it was quite a revolution in my mind when I got hold of that man's book on Virgil. I found that for the first time I had understood him, and that he had introduced me for the first time into an insight of Roman life, and pointed out the circumstances in which these works were written, and given their interpretation; and it has gone on in all manner of development, and it has spread out into other countries. Upon the whole, there is one reason why endowments are not given now as they were in old days, when they founded abbeys, colleges, and all kinds of things of that description, with such success as we know. All that has changed now. Why that has decayed away may in part be that people have become doubtful that colleges are now the real sources of that which I call wisdom; whether they are anything more—anything much more—than a cultivating of man in the specific arts. In fact, there has been a suspicion of that kind in the world for a long time. (A laugh.) What is an old saying, an old proverb, "An ounce of mother wit is worth a pound of clergy?" (Laughter.) There is a suspicion that a man is perhaps not nearly so wise as he looks, or because he has poured out speech so copiously. (Laughter.) When the seven free arts on which the old universities were based came to be modified a little, in order to be convenient for, or to promote, the wants of modern society—though perhaps some of them are obsolete enough even yet for some of us—there arose a feeling that mere vocality, mere culture of speech, if that is what comes out of a man, even though he may be a great speaker, an eloquent orator, yet there is no real substance there—if that is what was required and aimed at by the man himself, and by the community, that set him upon becoming a learned man. Maid-servants, I hear people complaining, are getting instructed in the "ologies," and so on, and are apparently totally ignorant of brewing, boiling, and baking—(laughter)—above all things, not taught what is necessary to be known, from the highest to the lowest—strict obedience, humility, and correct moral conduct. Oh, it is a dismal chapter, all that, if one went into it!—what has been done by rushing after fine speech. I have written down some very fierce things about that, perhaps considerably more emphatic than I would wish them to be now; but they are deeply my conviction. (Hear, hear.) There is very great necessity indeed of getting a little more silent than we are. It seems to me, the finest nations of the world—the English and the American—are going all away into wind and tongue. (Applause and laughter). But it will appear sufficiently tragical by and by, long after I am away out of it. Silence is the eternal duty of a man. He won't get to any real understanding of what is complex, and what is more than any other pertinent to his interests, without maintaining silence. "Watch the tongue" is a very old precept, and a most true one. I do not want to discourage any of you from your Demosthenes, and your studies of the niceties of language and all that. Believe me, I value that as much as any of you. I consider it a very graceful thing and a proper thing for every human creature to know what the implement which he uses in communicating his thoughts is, and how to make the very utmost of it. I want you to study Demosthenes, and know all his excellencies. At the same time, I must say that speech does not seem to me, on the whole, to have turned to almost any good account. Why tell me that a man is a fine speaker, if it is not the truth that he is speaking? Phocion, who did not speak at all, was a great deal nearer hitting the mark than Demosthenes. (Laughter.) He used to tell the Athenians, "You can't fight Philip. You have not the slightest chance with him. He is a man who holds his tongue; he has great disciplined armies; he can bribe anybody you like in your cities here; he is going on steadily with one unvarying aim toward a subject; and he will infallibly beat any kind of men such as you, going on ranging from shore to shore, with all that rampant nonsense." Demosthenes said to him one day, "The Athenians will get mad some day and kill you." "Yes," Phocion says, "me, when they are mad, and as soon as they get sane again, you." (Laughter and applause.) It is also told about him going to Messene on some deputation that the Athenians wanted on some kind of matter of an intricate and contentious nature, that Phocion went with some story in his mouth, to speak about. He was a man of few words, of no unveracity; and after he had gone on telling the story a certain time, there was one burst of interruption. One man interrupted, with something he tried to answer, and then another; and finally the people began bragging and bawling in endless debate. Phocion drew back altogether, struck dumb, and would not speak another word to any man, and he left it to them to decide in any way they liked. It appears to me there is a kind of eloquence in that which was equal to anything Demosthenes ever said, "Take your own way and let me out altogether." (Applause.) All these considerations, and manifold more connected with them—innumerable considerations, resulting from observation of the world at this moment—have led many people to doubt of the salutary effect of vocal education altogether. I do not mean to say it should be entirely excluded; but I look to something that will take hold of the matter much more closely, and not allow it to slip out of our fingers, and remain worse than it was. For, if a good speaker—an eloquent speaker—is not speaking the truth, is there a more horrid kind of object in creation? (Loud cheers.) Of such speech I hear all manner and kind of people say it is excellent; but I care very little how he said it, provided I understand it, and it be true. Excellent speaker? but what if he is telling me things that are not true, that are not the fact about it—if he has formed a wrong judgment about it—if he has no judgment in his mind to form a right conclusion in regard to the matter? An excellent speaker of that kind is, as it were, saying "Ho, every one that wants, to be persuaded of the thing that is not true, come hither! (Great laughter and applause.) I would recommend you to be very chary of that kind of excellent speech. (Renewed laughter.) Well, all that being the too-well-known products of our method of vocal education—the mouth merely operating on the tongue of the pupil, and teaching him to wag it in a particular way—(laughter)—it has made a great many thinking men entertain a very great distrust of this not very salutary way of procedure, and they have longed for some kind of practical way of working out the business. There would be room for a great deal of description about it, if I went into it; but I must content myself with saying that the most remarkable piece of reading that you may be recommended to take and try it if you can study it, is a book by Goethe—one of his last books, which he wrote when he was an old man of about 70 years of age—I think one of the most beautiful he ever wrote; full of mild wisdom, and which is found to be very touching by those who have eyes to discern and hearts to feel it. It is one of the pieces in "Wilhelm Meister's Travels." I read it through many years ago; and, of course, I had to read into its very heart when I was translating it (applause), and it has always dwelt in my mind as about the most remarkable bit of writing that I have known to be executed in these late centuries. I have often said there are ten pages of that which, if ambition had been my only rule, I would rather have written than have written all the books that have appeared since I came into the world. (Cheers.) Deep, deep is the meaning of what is said there. These pages turn on the Christian religion, and the religious phenomena of Christian life—altogether sketched out in the most airy, graceful, delicately wise kind of way, so as to keep himself out of the common controversies of the street and of the forum, yet to indicate what was the result of things he had been long meditating upon. Among others, he introduced in an aerial, flighty kind of way, with here and there a touch which grows into a beautiful picture, a scheme of entirely mute education, at least with no more speech than is absolutely necessary for what they have to do. Three of the wisest men that can be got are met to consider what is the function which transcends all others in importance to build up the young generation, which shall be free from all that perilous stuff that has been weighing us down, and clogging every step, and which is the only thing we can hope to go on with if we would leave the world a little better, and not the worse of our having been in it for those who are to follow. The man who is the eldest of the three says to Goethe: "You give by Nature to the well-formed children you bring into the world a great many precious gifts, and very frequently these are best of all developed by Nature herself, with a very slight assistance where assistance is seen to be wise and profitable, and with forbearance very often on the part of the overlooker of the process of education; but there is one thing that no child brings into the world with it, and without which all other things are of no use." Wilhelm, who is there beside him, says, "What is that?" "All who enter the world want it," says the eldest; "perhaps you yourself." Wilhelm says, "Well tell me what it is?" "It is," says the eldest, "Reverence." *Ehrfurcht*—"Reverence?" Honor done to those who are grander and better than you, without fear; distant from fear. *Ehrfurcht*—The soul of all religion that ever has been among men, or ever will be. And then he goes into practicality. He practically distinguishes the kinds of religion that are in the world, and he makes out three reverences. The boys are all trained to go through certain gesticulations, to lay their hands on their breast and look up to heaven, and they give their three reverences. The first and simplest is that of reverence for what is above us. It is the soul of all the pagan religions; there is nothing better in man than that. Then there is reverence for what is around us and about us—reverence for our equals, to which he attributes an immense power in the culture of man. The third is reverence for what is beneath us—to learn to recognize in pain, sorrow and contradiction, even in those things, odious as they are to flesh and blood—to learn that there lies in these a priceless blessing. And he defines that as being the soul of the Christian religion—the highest of all rehgions; a height, as Goethe says—and that is very true, even to the letter, as I consider—a height to which the human species was fated and enabled to attain, and from which, having once attained it, it can never retrograde. It cannot descend below that permanently, Goethe's idea is. Often one thinks it was good to have a faith of that kind—that always, in the most degraded, sunken, and unbelieving times, he calculates there will be found some few souls that will recognize what that meant; and that, the world having once received it, there is no fear of its retrograding. He goes on then to tell us the way in which they seek to teach boys—in the sciences particularly, whatever the boy is fit for. Wilhelm left his own boy there, expecting they would make him a master of arts or something of the kind; and when he comes back for him he sees a thunder cloud of dust coming over the plain, of which he could make nothing. It turned out to be a tempest of wild horses, managed by young lads who had a turn for hunting with their grooms. His own son was among them; and he found that the breaking of colts was the thing he was most suited for. (Laughter.) This is what Goethe calls art, which I should not make clear to you by any definition unless it were clear already. (A laugh.) I would not attempt to define it as music, painting, poetry, and so on; it is in quite a higher sense than the common one, and in which, I am afraid, most of our painters, poets, and music men, would not pass muster. (A laugh.) He considers that the highest pitch to which human culture can go; and he watches with great industry how it is to be brought about with men who have a turn for it. Very wise and beautiful it is. It gives one an idea that something greatly better is possible for man in the world. I confess it seems to me a shadow of what will come, unless the world is to come to a conclusion that it is perfectly frightful; some kind of scheme of education like that, presided over by the wisest and most sacred men that can be got in the world, and watching from a distance—a training in practicality at every turn; no speech in it except speech that is to be followed by action, for that ought to be the rule as nearly as possible among men. For rarely should a man speak at all unless it is to say that thing that is to be done; and let him go and do his part in it, and say no more about it. I should say there is nothing in the world you can conceive so difficult, *prima facie*, as that of getting a set of men gathered together as soldiers—rough, rude, ignorant people—gather them together, promise them a shilling a day; rank them up, give them very severe and sharp drill; and by bullying and drill—for the word drill seems as if it meant the treatment that would force them to learn—they learn what it is necessary to learn; and there is the man—a piece of an animated machine—a wonder of wonders to look at. He will go and obey one man, and walk into the cannon's mouth for him, and do anything whatever that is commanded him by his general officer; and I believe all manner of things in this way could be done if there were anything like the same attention bestowed. Very many things could be regimented and organized into the mute system of education that Goethe evidently adumbrates there. But, I believe, when people look into it, it will be found that they will not be very long in trying to make some efforts in that direction, for the saving of human labor, and the avoidance of human misery, would be unaccountable if it were set about and begun even in part. Alas! it is painful to think how very far away it is—any fulfilment of such things; for I need not hide from you, young gentlemen—and that is one of the last things I am going to tell you—that you have got into a very troublous epoch of the world; and I don't think you will find it improve the footing you have, though you have many advantages which we had not. You have careers open to you, by public examinations and so on, which is a thing much to be approved of, and which we hope to see perfected more and more. All that was entirely unknown in my time, and you have many things to recognize as advantages. But you will find the ways of the world more anarchical than ever, I think. As far as I have noticed, revolution has come upon us. We have got into the age of revolutions. All kinds of things are coming to be subjected to fire, as it were; hotter and hotter the wind rises around everything. Curious to say, now, in Oxford and other places that